

# UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO

## ORAL HISTORY, 1970-71

Interviewee: Eleven members of the University of Nevada, Reno, community

Interviewed: 1970-1971

Published: 1971

Interviewer: Lenore M. Kosso

UNOHP Catalog #048

### Description

In this volume, eleven prominent members of the university community commented on events at the university in the academic year of 1970-1971. The objective was to present a picture of the University of Nevada as observed by students, faculty, and others who were involved and concerned. They discussed general trends affecting the university and higher education throughout the country. The interviewees in this volume are: Charles H. "Gus" Perkins, president of the Alumni Association; Professor Eugene K. Grotegut, president, American Association of University Professors; Frankie Sue Del Papa, president, Associated Students of the University of Nevada (ASUN); Louis Test, president, ASUN Senate; George Cotton, co-chairman, Black Students Union; Harold Jacobsen, chairman, Board of Regents; Alan Burnside, president, Experimental College; Professor Edmund R. Barmettler, chairman, Faculty Senate; Dick Trachok, director, Intercollegiate Athletics; Sheila Caudle, editor, Sagebrush; and Janice Miller, chief justice, Student Judicial Council. Three more volumes in this series follow. The series was jointly sponsored by the Oral History Program and the University Archives.



**UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO**  
**ORAL HISTORY, 1970-71**

---



# **UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO**

## **ORAL HISTORY, 1970-71**

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF HELEN J. POULTON,  
FIRST ARCHIVIST OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, RENO.

An Oral History Conducted by Lenore M. Kosso

University of Nevada Oral History Program

Copyright 1971  
University of Nevada Oral History Program  
Mail Stop 0324  
Reno, Nevada 89557  
unohp@unr.edu  
<http://www.unr.edu/oralhistory>

All rights reserved. Published 1971.  
Printed in the United States of America

Publication Staff:  
Director: Mary Ellen Glass

### **University of Nevada Oral History Program Use Policy**

All UNOHP interviews are copyrighted materials. They may be downloaded and/or printed for personal reference and educational use, but not republished or sold. Under “fair use” standards, excerpts of up to 1000 words may be quoted for publication without UNOHP permission as long as the use is non-commercial and materials are properly cited. The citation should include the title of the work, the name of the person or people interviewed, the date of publication or production, and the fact that the work was published or produced by the University of Nevada Oral History Program (and collaborating institutions, when applicable). Requests for permission to quote for other publication, or to use any photos found within the transcripts, should be addressed to the UNOHP, Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557-0324. Original recordings of most UNOHP interviews are available for research purposes upon request.

---

## CONTENTS

Preface to the Digital Edition	ix
Introduction	xi
1. Alumni Association <i>Charles A. "Gus" Perkins, President</i>	1
2. American Association of University Professors <i>Professor Eugene K. Grotegut, President</i>	3
3. Associated Students of the University of Nevada <i>Frankie Sue Del Papa, President</i>	7
4. Associated Students of the University of Nevada Senate <i>Louis Test, President</i>	17
5. Black Students Union <i>George Cotton, Co-Chairman</i>	25
6. Board of Regents <i>Harold Jacobsen, Chairman</i>	33
7. Experimental College <i>Alan Burnside, President</i>	45

8. Faculty Senate	51
<i>Professor Edmund R. Barmettler, Chairman</i>	
9. Intercollegiate Athletics	59
<i>Dick Trachok, Director</i>	
10. <i>Sagebrush</i>	61
<i>Sheila Caudle, Editor</i>	
11. Student Judicial Council	65
<i>Janice Miller, Chief Justice</i>	
Original Index: For Reference Only	71



---

## PREFACE TO THE DIGITAL EDITION

Established in 1964, the University of Nevada Oral History Program (UNOHP) explores the remembered past through rigorous oral history interviewing, creating a record for present and future researchers. The program's collection of primary source oral histories is an important body of information about significant events, people, places, and activities in twentieth and twenty-first century Nevada and the West.

The UNOHP wishes to make the information in its oral histories accessible to a broad range of patrons. To achieve this goal, its transcripts must speak with an intelligible voice. However, no type font contains symbols for physical gestures and vocal modulations which are integral parts of verbal communication. When human speech is represented in print, stripped of these signals, the result can be a morass of seemingly tangled syntax and incomplete sentences—totally verbatim transcripts sometimes verge on incoherence. Therefore, this transcript has been lightly edited.

While taking great pains not to alter meaning in any way, the editor may have removed false starts, redundancies, and the “uhs,” “ahs,” and other noises with which speech is often liberally sprinkled; compressed some passages which, in unaltered form, misrepresent the chronicler's meaning; and relocated some material to place information in its intended context. Laughter is represented with [laughter] at the end of a sentence in which it occurs, and ellipses are used to indicate that a statement has been interrupted or is incomplete...or that there is a pause for dramatic effect.

As with all of our oral histories, while we can vouch for the authenticity of the interviews in the UNOHP collection, we advise readers to keep in mind that these are remembered pasts, and we do not claim that the recollections are entirely free of error. We can state, however, that the transcripts accurately reflect the oral history recordings on which they were based. Accordingly, each transcript should be approached with the

same prudence that the intelligent reader exercises when consulting government records, newspaper accounts, diaries, and other sources of historical information. All statements made here constitute the remembrance or opinions of the individuals who were interviewed, and not the opinions of the UNOHP.

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, most have been reformatted, a process that was completed in 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

For more information on the UNOHP or any of its publications, please contact the University of Nevada Oral History Program at Mail Stop 0324, University of Nevada, Reno, NV, 89557-0324 or by calling 775/784-6932.

Alicia Barber  
Director, UNOHP  
July 2012

---

## INTRODUCTION

This year the Oral History Project at the University of Nevada, Reno and the University Archives initiated a new program which we expect will become an annual occurrence. We asked eleven prominent members of the University community to comment on their year in office; all but one held his position on a temporary basis. The objective was to present a picture of the past year at the University of Nevada as observed by students, faculty, and others who were involved and concerned. Not only were we interested in specific events, but in the general trends affecting our University and higher education throughout the country.

Those selected for the oral history were approached with a letter explaining the project and then were called for an appointment. At this time the interviewer clarified the nature and purpose of the project and answered any questions. With one or two exceptions, the individuals selected were very receptive to the idea and all of those who were asked finally agreed to participate. The interviews were tape recorded, transcribed and returned to the author for editing. It was stressed that

the colloquial nature of the script should be maintained and in all cases, it was. In general, very few changes were made by the contributors.

The results are here for the researcher and the interested reader to examine. They do, indeed, present a vivid picture of the University of Nevada 1970-71. There is little doubt about the major events on campus and one finds a pattern of shared concerns throughout the history. One general observation especially significant to this interviewer is that the University of Nevada is becoming an increasingly student-dominated institution. Students are aware of contemporary problems in higher education; they recognize the failures of the University as well as its potential. Students are serious in their demand for change and their desire for action. Students of today have the knowledge and the capability to implement their demands. The University is moving with them and by them. This is not to say that the senior representatives in this history have failed to recognize that problems do

exist and that change may be necessary, but their attitude lacks the enthusiasm and the urgency of students. Although they are not unaware of the trends, the older members of the University community have not shown the same readiness to act and to change. The students are not only ready, they are acting and changing.

Lenore Kosso, Interviewer  
University of Nevada, Reno  
1971

---

## ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

### CHARLES A. “GUS” PERKINS, PRESIDENT

And for the [Oral History Project] I would like to say that my term started in October of 1970 and will end in October of 1971.

Our major programs in Alumni Association are a giving program, and this year is headed by Neil Romero. There are somewhere in excess of 10,000 alumni from the University of Nevada, Reno, and last year they gave \$29,000 for the campus to use. This year's chairman will be trying to exceed this. This giving program has gone on for about four years.

Our other major committee is the Homecoming committee, and this year is headed by Art Kess. This year, Art is trying very hard to change the program of Homecoming. In the past it's been a parade, a cocktail party on a Friday night, and a dance and a party on Saturday night, and not too much participation with students in the University. And this year, I think that his goal is to get more participation among the alumni and the students and the faculty. So this will be happening in October, and next year's president can report and say what has happened there.

We have another major committee. It's small, it's just been formed a couple of years, and we call this the Morrill Hall committee. The Board of Regents has given the Alumni Association the right to use Morrill Hall and to rebuild it, and it has been estimated that this will cost up to \$400,000. With a giving program that would only attain \$29,000 in one year and to run all our other programs from it, we have a major task ahead of us. So the people many years from now will be able to tell if we've been successful or not in rebuilding Morrill Hall into an Alumni Center. There is talk of a plan of making the third floor of the Morrill Hall into a museum, so this will be of interest in the future. Mrs. Virginia Phillips is the chairman of this and has been working very hard for about three years. To this point, we have a rough drawing of what we want done to the building, and we have a pretty painting to show anyone who is interested in seeing what we expect it will look like when it is finished.

This year also, as in past years, and in every year to come, we hope, the Alumni

Association sponsors a Graduation Tea for all the graduates, and also, at the same time, the Golden Reunion for people who have graduated fifty years or more ago. Last year's participation at Golden Reunion I believe was somewhere around maybe twelve people, and this year already we've had up to thirty people make reservations. So it's becoming more successful. The Graduation Tea is a major item for the Alumni Association and we feel that it is very worthwhile, but each year as the University grows, the cost grows and we don't know how many more years we'll be able to support this.

One major item that the Alumni Association participated in this year was in the redevelopment of the tram. The redevelopment of the tram was brought about by the students. And the Alumni Association was pleased to participate in it in a way of donating money for the rebuilding of it. The existing tram has been there many years and people can look back through history and I'm sure that the tram that they're going to build is going to be there for many years, because the wooden deck that is there now is going to be replaced with concrete. Only one side will have a rail toward the ditch, while the other side will be a bench so people could sit in the Manzanita Bowl.

Also, along with our giving program, we have a special projects portion, and this year, one of the special projects that was brought about was the replacing of the lighting at the Lake Street and Center Street entrances. This was done by Sierra Pacific Power Company and it was, I believe, in the amount of about \$3,000. So this will be a lasting thing for people to observe in the next few years (probably not as lasting as the tram, however).

And finally, the University is changing, the students, especially, are changing their views and their outlook, and along with it

they're forcing, I think you might say, a change in people. This is reflected in the Alumni Association in that at our last meeting we had a motion to form an ad hoc committee to make a report by October 1 on what the actual goals of the Alumni Association are and how we want to spend our money. In the future, we may want to change some of our targets that we've had in the past, maybe change our Homecoming event and other things. I believe that this is just following along with the trend of the students, and so this will be another thing that we'll find out by October, if our views have been changed radically or otherwise by the students.

---

## AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS *PROFESSOR EUGENE K. GROTEGUT, PRESIDENT*

The purpose of the AAUP is to bring to the local campus, the local campuses throughout the United States, the benefit of a century of profound concern with higher education. The information and the traditions, these various solutions to a multitude of problems facing higher education are assembled by this organization and made available to all campuses throughout the country through the more than 90,000 faculty members in the United States who are members of the association.

I think, with respect to the Reno campus, the general response on the part of, say, the public and the administration to the AAUP has varied from year to year according to the vagaries of chapter elections and chapter representatives and their personal relations with various members of the academic community. But I would hope that both the administration, the Regents, the students and members of the general community would realize that every principle upon which AAUP actions are based is directly related to the stability and to excellence in higher education in the country.

Unlike many professional associations, and quite distinctly different from labor unions, the AAUP places the highest priority on the integrity and effectiveness of the institution and the profession as a whole. No principle is ever advocated which places the individual faculty member above and superior to the welfare of the institution and the profession. It must be noted, however, that the AAUP does view the personal integrity and the academic freedom of the individual faculty member as an absolutely essential ingredient of the best quality of higher education, and only through this means can the integrity of the institution itself be maintained.

The Reno chapter of the American Association of University Professors has been extremely active during this past academic year due to the series of crises and numbers of problems that faced the Reno campus of the University of Nevada in '70-'71 I might list a sampling of the kinds of problems in which the chapter and its officers were directly involved in the course of the year:

Of course, perhaps the most notable case was that of Professor Paul Adamian, whose termination from the faculty, from this campus, was a very controversial matter.

Connected with Professor Adamian's termination was the introduction of an Interim Code of Conduct with which the AAUP was directly concerned.

The AAUP, its membership, played a leading role in negotiating with the governor and the legislature with respect to the budget of this campus, and were instrumental in bringing about participation by the Alumni Association and others as well, among the general public, with respect to the budget. The AAUP chapter here also has given assistance to various divisions of the University in helping to resolve certain administrative problems, as in the School of Nursing.

The AAUP was also directly involved in helping initiate certain review procedures having to do with granting of tenure to young members of the faculty and review procedures for promotion. The AAUP is presently concerned with attempting to determine the procedures and attempting to determine the integrity of the procedures followed, for example, in the system in matters of promotion. The faculty review procedure has been challenged by an action of the Regents. It's been questioned and the chapter is now interested in determining what are the relations in this respect between faculty and the Board of Regents.

One other area which is of interest, which may prove to be of interest, is an attempt by the members of the chapter to investigate and to collect information on the various regential structures throughout the United States, that is to say, what are the various precedents, what are the various practices in the United States with respect to governing boards of universities.

We did begin this current year to encourage a discussion on certain possible alternatives to the present structure of the Board of Regents, and it is hoped that after careful research and careful preparation that the chapter may assist the Regents in the state, its legislature, in considering alternatives to the present structure of the board, with the objective, it is hoped, of enhancing the information available to the Regents, flexibility, the facility with which they could respond, can respond, to problems that face the University, and this will be an area of major concern over the next two years for the chapter.

If I might turn now to discussing in somewhat greater detail the case of Professor Adamian, I shall report on the position of the chapter with respect to this case. The details of the case I'm sure have already been recorded elsewhere in this oral history. I might say that the position of the AAUP was one of sharp division. There was great concern about that, and desire for due process to be adopted by the University in reviewing Paul Adamian's status. But on the whole, no real consensus could be, or agreement could be arrived at with respect of the chapter's position in the details of the case of the action taken vis-à-vis Professor Adamian.

The chapter did go so far as to pass a resolution and to implement this resolution providing for a chapter fund which would be at the disposal of the executive committee of the chapter to disburse for legal aid in behalf of faculty members seeking legal redress. The disbursement of these funds, however, is possible only after broad discussion with the membership.

In the case of Paul Adamian, for example, the chapter at most would probably approve of filing an amicus brief in a legal litigation which Professor Adamian might initiate in order that the chapter would be able to pose



certain questions of a general nature that have to do with the profession itself.

One area of major concern, as indicated to the chapter, was the consideration by the University community of a code of conduct for faculty and students and for the academic community as a whole in this past year. I think it should be recorded that in advance of the Adamian matter, which was connected with Governors Day of 1970, the local chapter had already begun deliberations of such a conduct code, entitling it, if I'm not mistaken, "On Conduct Inimical to Academic Freedom."

A few months after we had begun our discussion of this subject and deliberations on such a code, the Governor's Day affair took place, and this was followed shortly thereafter by an Interim Code of Conduct which was initiated by the Regents. After the various elements of the academic community made tentative feelers toward resolution of different opinions on the code, the AAUP, shortly after appearance of this code, established a committee, a broad based committee, chaired by Professor Howard Cords of the School of Agriculture, to review the Regents' proposed document, to amend it in light of faculty interests and in the light of interests of the entire University. Extended discussions and investigations lasted under the direction of Professor Cords throughout the entire summer of 1970. This was the major, initial faculty contribution to the code.

The final report of the AAUP committee was then turned over to a senate subcommittee and many of the members of the senate subcommittee on the code had been members of the AAUP committee. The code then went, after further revision by this senate subcommittee and after consultation with and working with the student group concerned with the same document, was then submitted to the Board of Regents, who returned it for

further revisions to the Coordinating Council of the University system.

This past Saturday, the Board of Regents, meeting as a committee of the whole in order to review the final draft or drafts of the code, showed wisdom in the view of the AAUP in choosing to adopt with only minor changes the Coordinating Council's version which incorporated faculty views in the code. For the first time in many years, due to the somewhat unorthodox approach to budgetary matters on the part of the new incumbent in the governor's office in Carson City, faculty members, coincidentally members of the AAUP chapter, were deeply involved in negotiations with the governor's office and the legislature in behalf of the University's proposed budget. Members of the chapter met with the governor early in '71 in order to persuade him in certain points that he had perhaps overlooked in his budgetary considerations. No great substantial success was achieved due to the fact that the budget had reached final form before faculty had an opportunity to present their views.

However, in the succeeding months, during which the legislature was in session considering the budget, the AAUP continued to present faculty positions which coincided largely with the positions of the University administration and of the Regents, and were perhaps the most vocal representatives of the University in this debate. Through numerous presentations before the Alumni Association, for example, the Alumni Association support for the university position was recruited through various presentations through the various media. It was hoped that broad support among the general public might also be brought to bear on the legislative deliberations.

Ultimately after open letters from the AAUP to the governor and distributed to

the legislature, through various refinements of University presentation, assisted by the AAUP, the budget was improved to some extent. The original proposed budget from the chief administrative office of the state was increased substantially, though still fell far short of the original University budget.

Associated with budget problems, the chapter became immediately involved in reviewing administrative actions which might threaten the professional integrity of the faculty on this campus. Fortunately, through the skill of the administration, through the increase in the budget and other factors, it's possible to report that no significant damage to programs and to faculty security was realized.

One action that the AMP has taken with respect to the budget in the anticipation of such problems in the future has been support for revisions in the University Code which will provide for a standing budget committee representing the Faculty Senate. And it can be reported at this point, this—such a standing committee is not—this is not yet passed the faculty or worked its way through the entire legislative process of the University, but the AAUP was able to make contact with the chancellor of the University, who, by the way, has been cooperative in including faculty information for his budgetary considerations. It has been possible, though, to reach an agreement with the chancellor to permit a member of such a standing budget committee to be the liaison between the faculty and the chancellor's office so as to facilitate a bidirectional flow of information which should prove to be an advantage both to the chancellor's office and to the increased information on the part of the faculty with regard to budgetary problems. It is hoped that such a committee will have a liaison

member in each administrative office on this campus as well.

It might be of interest in this record, it perhaps should be recorded at this point, that through the efforts of the local chapter of the Association, President Miller has extended an invitation to the national office of the Association, inviting them to hold their national meeting in 1975 in Reno, Nevada at the University, the University acting as host of the Association.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the present executive committee of the local chapter views it as its highest priority in its efforts—the highest priority in its efforts has been given to efforts to improve communication among the various segments of the University community. All too frequently, the AAUP, particularly here, has been looked upon as slightly suspect, often disruptive, however mistaken the impression might be.

The present chapter intends to make every effort to educate the entire community as to the objectives of the Association, and insofar as possible, whenever possible, bring about a conciliation between different positions adopted by the various members of the University community.

---

## ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA

### *FRANKIE SUE DEL PAPA, PRESIDENT*

My name is Frankie Sue Del Papa and I'm a former president of the ASUN. I originally ran for this position because of my active involvement in student government ever since I got here. I was active as a freshman and then I got into the student senate for a couple of years and I served on a wide variety of University boards and committees and was dorm officer and became very much involved, and when the time came for the spring elections of last year, that is, 1969-70, that year, I just faced a decision and decided to run and got elected.

I hoped to accomplish a number of things. I can still recall my three planks of my platform which, of course, were long-range planning, better communication and cooperation with Las Vegas, and decentralization of the ASUN office. And it's really remarkable; over the year I think we did accomplish some long-range planning. I think that in the years to come, you will see a new student union addition which I believe we did start this year, the idea rolling, perhaps the University senate, which I would really hope they move towards. I think

those are two of the principal things as far as long range that we did start.

As far as better communication, cooperation with Las Vegas, I found if the student body president of both campuses could just get together on a lot of these issues, their power would be tremendous, because I found a couple of times the student body president and myself, you know, we couldn't quite agree on something, so we were divided before the board. And it's really awful, you know; when you go before a Board of Regents, you have to get your act together; you have to know what you're going to say and you have to at least have them not speaking against you.

One particular instance, the student body president down at Las Vegas spoke against us on this athletic issue when the guy didn't know what he was talking about. The situation down there is completely different than the situation up here, and he had no right to say what he said. I've learned my lesson. When this issue came up again at a subsequent meeting, he did not say anything. And it was planned out before that he wouldn't say anything. So,

you know, those are just a lot of things you learn; I feel really sad because, after a year, you know, you just know it, you know, and you have to leave office. I think this is one of the faults of student government, is when people are at their prime, they're leaving. But it's a good educational experience and I have no regrets. Those are some of the things I hoped to accomplish.

As far as decentralization, I found, too, that you have to keep your thumbs on everything, you know, 'cause if you don't, you just don't know what's happening. People have a tendency not to report back, and I don't care what type of leader you are as far as delegation of authority, if you don't put some input into it yourself, you're bound to fail. That's the way people are, and that was a lesson I learned all along the way.

As far as my accomplishments, I feel very good about this year. I think that—sometimes I think that people have taken what I have said in the paper wrong as far as pointing out the little things, but the little things to me, do really mean a lot, as far as getting refrigerators to the dorm kids, because it significantly improved their living situation.

Improving the activities on campus, I think we had an outstanding year as far as lectures were concerned, and films. And I think these are very important, especially in the light of the two surveys that we took at the last two registrations. That's where the students want their money to go. They want more concerts, they want more films, they want more lectures, and we as student officials, elected by them, have the responsibility to see that this is where the money is spent. I think that this is part of what edged us on so much in this athletic issue because the athletic situation, the college campus of ten years ago, just doesn't exist. The "rah-rah," you know, it's just not there. And so I think

that our student attitudes have changed and student government has to keep up with those attitudinal changes.

I think as far as other accomplishments, I feel really good about going out into the state, I really do, because I know I went four times to Yerington. I'm going back to Yerington this coming Monday. I went two times to Fallon, and twice in Las Vegas. As a matter of fact, we went, too, and it's just really good to be asked to speak around, you know, various parts of the state, and I think that we did, this year, help community relations.

And I think this was a very bad year, you know, all over. I think the actions of the state legislature proved that. I think if the University is wise, the University can learn from this biennium. It doesn't have to happen again. I think we were a little negligent in our public relations. I think that if we only have symposiums, and if we only have little get-togethers at crisis periods, then we're not doing our job here. Because we can't expect them to be one hundred percent behind us in a crisis. But we can expect that if we have consulted them, informed them of what we are doing the whole year. I think that at least three times a year, the president of the University should be giving a State of the University address, at least three times!! I think that a lot of our activities, invitations should be sent to these state legislators. Because I know when I was over in the state legislature this session, one of the men on the assembly ways and means committee, who was down on our buildings and grounds budget more than a lot of the other members, was an assemblyman who'd graduated from this University who was supposedly active in the Alumni Association, yet the man had not been informed. You know, he just didn't know the facts. And so there he was, knocking our B and G budget. You know, the problem

wasn't even Las Vegas, which—you know, everybody tries to put the blame on Las Vegas. It wasn't that. It was right here, an alumnus of this University, which, I think, you know, we have to work on.

As far as my other accomplishments, I think I really accomplished a lot internally within student government. As far as meeting with groups such as the alumni groups, the faculty senate groups, I feel very good about these actions. I made a lot of mistakes but I don't think anything was that detrimental to our year, and it was a fantastically educational experience for me, personally, just fantastic! I wish that more people could participate in it, and participate in it fully, because especially when my instance, I'm political science major and I can learn all the political theory I want to from the books. But having been given the opportunity to practice it for a year, I know that this year has been more beneficial to me than my other three. I know it. I think it is really sad when more people don't take advantage of this, don't take advantage of the editorships of the various publications. They're crazy not to, because when you're working—in the instance of the yearbook editor, when you're working with a \$20,000 budget, when you can use all the film you want to, you know, you're crazy not to do it, if that's what you're going to do for the rest of your life.

And I think in my instance, too, it is particularly good. I intend to go on to law school for three years and this year was the break that I needed, the break that I think everyone should have in their education, or else it becomes sterile, you know, because you just push yourself so hard and pretty soon you learn the system so well that you're just feeding back exactly what they want you to feed back and you're not truly assimilating it. So I think this year in other ways has been particularly good for me, personally.

As far as higher education, what were the most important things that happened this year? I have to laugh because I think that, ironically, the most important thing is making other people, making the people in power look at what they've got, because—and a case in point is, I'm working with an alumni member, Barbara Thornton. She's working on the teacher effectiveness award, and the criteria, for this award were drawn up, the criteria were drawn up in 1968, and it's just really, really funny to look at the criteria now, you know, what they wrote in 1968. Because it was completely faculty oriented, faculty chosen, whereas if they were to do that now, they couldn't pull it off. They couldn't. There has to be student representation. The people have found out that no longer are students going to—in most cases, no longer are they going to sit back and just very quietly accept things. They have to be consulted, because these are the people whose lives, these and the faculty, their lives are affected most by the decision making process on this campus. And they have to be consulted. There's just no doubt about it.

I think that higher education more and more is realizing the complete stupidity of grades, complete stupidity, and even tests—what do tests tell you? You know, really. And here we are, we and the system of higher education, we're giving these tests, we're giving these grades for the outside, for General Electric, for these other companies, you know, who could very well use their own tests. And I think that if people did not have to worry about these so much, that—I think you'd see a better campus.

The worst time on the campus, in my mind, is final examination period. That's when you find the most irritability, the most people who are up on drugs, you know, just to stay awake to study. The final exam periods are



horrible times and they shouldn't be. They shouldn't be, especially when you go back to the original meaning as to why examinations were given, and they were given so that people could be accepted on the level of the other masters, you know? Only I think we've lost that entirely, and people try to use these for, you know, judging other people, and you just can't. They're just not effective means to judge.

I feel the same way about teacher evaluation, you know? A lot of people—the Board of Regents just passed at this last meeting \$4,000 for both campuses to evaluate their teachers. I know what they want. They want a simple means to help them with their tenure decision, and there is no simple way to do that. There's no way that you can do it. The \$4,000, in my mind, could have been used ten times more effectively paying for a part of the salary for the vice president of Student Services, which we've needed, which we've been promised for the last two years. There's no money for it, and here they are, giving this money for teacher evaluation. When there's—and like, they want standard, you know, standard evaluation; there's no—you cannot have a standard evaluation. The departments, the colleges are just too different, you know.

And it's really sad, and I'll go into my feelings of the Board of Regents later, but it's really sad that we get caught up like this, you know? I just finished reading a book by Paul Goodman on Compulsory Miseducation, and it's one of the best books I've read in a long time, and the book was written in 1964, and it can't understand why some of these things haven't been done.

And one of the saddest things that I think I've learned this year is the fact that in nine cases out of ten, people will not move, people will not make a decision unless they're forced to. And it's really, really sad because when you've reached the point that you have

to make a decision, then you're not going to please anyone, because to let a problem get out of hand to that point, you've really been derelict in your duties, and I found out that in nine cases out of ten on this campus; that's the way it is.

Let's see, since I have been the first woman [ASUN president] in about twenty-five years, it's been a very interesting year as a woman. I found, for instance, one thing I pointed out, I went to the May meeting of the Board of Regents last year in Elko and instead of getting together for luncheon with the men, I got stuck with the women, you know, and like—a lot of times it's been that way.

But at times it's been to my advantage to be a woman because I found that I get more attention, you know, when here is a woman speaking, especially when there's just so few women, you know, involved, and overall, I'd say that my being a woman has been to my advantage. There have been times when it makes me really mad when people try to pull things on you, 'cause they think you are a woman, you know, and you'll go along with them.

And I think that this year has been a good year for Women's Liberation on this campus and in this community. I think that the two symposiums on women were outstanding, outstanding affairs. And I think that this type of activity should be considered because it doesn't matter if a few people laugh and you get the butt of a lot of jokes, you know, because deep down you're really making people think, you know, and there's so much prejudice; there really is.

For instance, I went the other day to apply for a scholarship for law school, men only, you know, and like it's got—you know, it's gotten to the point where it's—I know it's going to be this way in law school: I know that I'm going to be in the very much minority. But I look

forward to it because I think that they need—a lot of these men, a lot of these men professors need to be exposed to intelligent women, because we are intelligent, just as intelligent as the men; we do have great capabilities that haven't been tapped, and to stick us at home with ten children, you know, and running the home is just totally out of line in this day and age.

I think that the people who—of the overpopulation problem is a significant problem that the women themselves have got to watch. I think that there should be better—this is another area of higher education I think they've really missed, and that's the higher education of the person, their sexual activities, their birth control. All of this information is never discussed. Where do they get this information? They don't get it from their parents. I know, you know, nine sets of parents out of ten don't tell their children anything. And I think that this is one area that higher education is really, really lacking in as far as getting the information out to the human being, that's going to be of some worth to them later on.

And I think that as far as what type of sexual activity, the birth control information, overpopulation, these are problems that we should be really, really into and that the University should tackle. And there just aren't any classes on this, and I think that's really, really bad. This is kind of tied up in my idea as women on campus. I see that a woman, I think more than a man, has to be a little bit more ambitious, a little bit harder working and just have a lot more stamina than the average man to get anywhere, because she does face a lot of problems and she does face a lot of tradition, and she faces a lot of men who are—who feel threatened by her, and this is what is really sad, because they just don't have to, you know? There's plenty of room

in this world for women and men as human beings on the same level, and I think that that's the most beautiful relationship, when you can accept each other as equals, and not have to feel that one or the other is superior. And I think that more and more men are moving this way, and I think more and more women are, too, which is really good, because I think it's really sad when women just very complacently accept their role.

I'd like to comment now on a couple of things that I think I would have liked to have seen done this year, and we just didn't get around to completely. One is calendar reform. And I think that we saw the defeat of 4-1-4 and the 4-4-1 because of tradition on this campus. And primarily what I was after is getting the first semester over before Christmas vacation. I think that it's psychologically and educationally very damaging to have a semester run after Christmas because you have a two-week break; you know people aren't going to study over the holidays. You know that there are just too many other activities going on for them to concentrate on it, and that is a pretty big break, you know, for them to be away from their studies. Then you expect them to come back for a week of instruction and usually that week is spent, the teacher is trying to catch up on everything he should have been doing the whole semester and then the week after that, invariably they give you papers, reports, and all this kind of stuff and then final exams. I think it's just a total waste. And I think that it'd be very much better educationally and psychologically if we could end that first semester under whatever system, just end it before Christmas. That was my biggest concern. And I think that this is one area that Faculty Senate and the student senate and I hope everyone else who has a conscience will work on this next year.

I think as far as academic matters, the other academic matter that I'd like to go into—and it's not even academic—it's the governing structure that has representation from the students, the faculty and the administration. I think that's the only answer. There's so much duplication of efforts, there's so many channels that you have to go through, so much time taken up whereas I think we could cut this red tape if we had this one governing body, this one form, where you could get these ideas across, and I think that if we did have it, also, I think it would be a much more unified voice for us in dealing with those people that this campus has to deal with, such as the Board of Regents, such as the Nevada legislature, and even the downtown community. If this one group could ever get together, it'd be just tremendous, and I think that more universities across the country are moving this way and I think that probably, I would hope in the near future, this is what we would see here.

I'd also like to go on as far as my actions with the Board of Regents. Overall, I found out the Board of Regents are very concerned, very dedicated, typical good citizens. However, you cannot administer a university and its complex affairs two days a month and expect that things are going to run smoothly. I found that the meetings—it's really funny, you know. You learn this after you sit through a year of Board of Regents meetings. The first items on the agenda, they go over very, very picayunishly. You know, everything is with a fine-tooth comb. For the first, say, nine or ten items, it takes up the first day. Then they find that they have got a whole other half an agenda, and they always have to catch the Saturday afternoon plane. No matter where they're at, they have to catch that plane. So, whew, you just run through final items. You put off to the next month, you know, not

thinking. Well, maybe—maybe they do think about it; I'm not being fair on this. I'm sure they do think about it but not completely realizing how much they're affecting other peoples' lives by not making a decision. And it's really sad, because like I said, they are very, very good people. It's just—most of them just do not have the time to be a Regent and to make the decisions that that position entails.

And I think that, in my opinion, it would be much, much better if we could work on through the Nevada constitution, through the Nevada legislature, getting these positions appointed for not longer than a six-year term, though, by the governor. I think that—and paid, too; they should be paid for what they're doing. We're not in the day and age where people do this; nothing is gratis any more, you know? It's just—you have to pay these people, and you have to try and get somebody to do a job full-time, because a lot of our problems are just right there. That's the reason for them, I think.

As far as the Nevada legislature is concerned, in all fairness, I think that they were a bit harsh on us; I think that they were, and the governor, too, and this was a result of last year's Governor's Day activities.

However, in all fairness to the other side, too, we should have been more on our toes. We should have had more people informed. We should have had more people lobbying because that's the whole key, you know? Right now, it's how you present your story to the other man. And I'm not saying that's the way it should be, but it's a fact of life; that's the way it is. And if you're a political realist, you deal with the situation as it is and you give them what they ask for, because there are enough people on this campus where we could be—you know, we could be presenting a better front to them. And I think that this is one thing that we really, really have to work



on. I think that if we're wise we will take this opportunity to get rid of a lot of irrelevant stuff that we have here. We will take this opportunity to clean up our house internally, as far as getting rid of the stuff that there is no longer a need for, you know, and do it now because we have to. We're under an economic, you know, kind of like, hatchet.

But, work on the next biennium starting now. You know, it's not too late. You see the high school teachers, the elementary teachers, the public school system, most effective lobbyists over there, and they got what they asked for because they started early enough and they applied the pressure where it needed to be applied. And this is something the University is going to have to learn, too, because the day for us sitting back on our haunches and just having it come to us, those days are over.

I think that one of the most important things that happened this year—and once again, I point it up kind of like an irony as a result of Governor's Day—were these town and gown meetings. Town and gown meetings came about as a result of Governor's Day. But I think that they really, really helped the University and it's really sad that this wasn't going on beforehand, like I said before. They culminated in a fantastic symposium, in my mind, which was held in February, and that was on the mission and purpose of the University. And I think it brought together a lot of people who were greatly concerned about the University and a lot of good ideas were exchanged, and this is always good because you have to continually have to have new blood, you know, feeding in, or else you get caught up in the same old habits.

But the most impressive thing, I think, about that symposium was the presence of a Dr. Martin from Berkeley, just a fantastic man. And I just wish that, you know, more

people like him, you know, were available to come and be with you and just talk with you.

There are so many good people here, but we—you know, we never exchange ideas 'cause we're all in our own little nooks and corners, you know, and we never get out sometimes to exchange ideas and it's good to have stuff like this, Institutional self-studies that Dr. Barmettler proposed is a very, very good thing, you know, because if the institution does not change from within, sooner or later, things reach a point where the change is forced on them from without.

A perfect case in point is this stupid Interim Code which was laid on from the top in June [1970]. The final action hasn't even been taken on it yet, you know, the final complete copy which will be practically a year later, you know. And it's really sad that we couldn't have worked on this together, you know, and gotten it to them, because they were right; there was a need for it, a very significant need for it. And students and faculty had been requested to do such a code, and, of course, you know how students and faculty are; they put things like this off, and this leads me, I think, to my biggest, I think, revelation, my biggest complaint, and my biggest recommendation as far as the future of this University—the future of anything—and that is the committee system on this campus.

I have found that in the course of a year that the committees on this campus are totally, totally archaic, totally inoperative. You put something in a committee and it's very likely you'll never see it again. Or if you will, maybe it'll be three years later, as in the case of the alcoholic beverage policy. And what I'm saying is, people and students, faculty, they shouldn't have to wait; they shouldn't be treated like that. You know, to me, a “no” answer is better than a “maybe” and a committee. Because at least you know where

you stand with a “no” answer. At least you can work as far as modifying, as far as compromising, as far as revising your proposals. But when you get a “maybe” and a committee, you don’t know where you stand and it takes them forever to make up their minds. And I find that practically every problem that we face on this campus is because somewhere along the line, it bogged down in a committee. And that day and age is just passed, you know? You have to set deadlines on things because people want answers, and I think part of—you know, we’re living in a television age and people get used to seeing an answer within thirty minutes on television and makes them think that they’re going to get a thirty-minute answer, anyway, which, of course, they’re not, which, of course, is a problem you have to work under. But you do open something. And you can set a deadline and you can meet it if you want to. And the people on this campus are just totally out of line when they think that they can just put these things off forever because sooner or later it catches up to them, and when it does, it would have been a lot better had they taken the easier route, in my mind. I think that’s my biggest complaint about this campus. And it’s really sad, too, because I think it’s a pretty big complaint about the democratic process. Now, I believe in the democratic process with all my heart, but when people take that long to make decisions and take that long to change and when they only respond to pressure and violence, sooner or later you show the other side what it takes to get a decision made.

And I think that in many instances higher education, in many instances government, itself, has taught our young radicals what they need to do to get a decision made. And it’s really sad because they’ve taught them that they [government] will only respond to pressure, that they will only respond to a crisis, and that’s totally out of line. I think that sooner or later, the administration here, the government out

there, has to wake up to that fact, or else we’re really, really going to be in trouble.

I think that kind of just sums up my year. It’s just—you learn so much. I went in last year in April, and you know, you always have to aim really high because if you don’t aim high, you know, you don’t have anything to fall back on, and I was very idealistic and I thought that I could accomplish a lot, and a lot of times I went through the channels. I went through, because I do believe in the democratic process and I do believe that that’s the way to go. But a lot of times I found that you just don’t get anywhere going through the channels, you know? And I found towards the end of my term when a problem came up, I was taking it directly to one of the Board of Regent members that I knew and laying it on the line to him, or her. Because that was the best way of doing it. We would sit back, we would write letters, we would go to all the people we were supposed to go to, present the issue to all the people we were to present it to, and nothing was ever done, you know? And it was really, really sad because—I know I’m not a radical, and I know that. However, I’ve become more radical this year because of the frustration, you know? Sitting back and watching a whole year go by with the same problems very much evident at the end of that year as they were at the beginning, and there’s no excuse for it, no excuse whatsoever. I know that change takes a long time; I know that, and I wasn’t asking for anything overnight. But I also know that a lot of people sat back and did nothing, and they had the power to do something, and that’s when it’s really sad.

I watched this year a change on this campus. I watched so much life and activity last spring and it was really sad that it had to culminate in something like Governor’s Day. It was really sad. But those people were right. There was no excuse for there being a military ceremony,

separated out with all the honor like that. Now, I'm not one that advocates taking ROTC off campus, because it should be here for those people who want it here. However, I'm not one, on the other hand, that says that it should play a major role, because it shouldn't. Everything has to have its proper perspective. I think that this is another lesson we learned this past year.

I think that doing away with a military ceremony for this Governor's Day was a significant advance. And I feel—you know, it's really funny because sometimes I think student government's caught very much in the middle as a buffer between the students and the administration. I think the administration is caught sometimes as a buffer in the middle between the students and faculty and the Board of Regents. And I even feel sorry for the Board of Regents sometimes, because I know they're caught up in the middle between the University community and the downtown people and the downtown community.

And it's really sad that we can't get it all together, you know? I don't know; I don't know what is lacking. Maybe it's progressive leadership, you know, or maybe it's just someone who could take the time to listen, you know, and bring all these ideas together. But you really, really learn a lot about people, being in a position like this. I can see where the University is going and sometimes it frightens me. It frightens me when we have to raise out-of-state tuition to such a point we're forced to, even though the majority of Nevada students go out of state to school, and sooner or later, it's going to cost us more because the other states will just raise their out-of-state tuition.

It's really sad when the University doesn't sit down and define its goals so that the whole University could be working towards a common—you know, a common direction. I think this is something that is needed. I think

that it's also a—the University has to get together and support, you know, areas within itself, too. I think that there needs to be more internal communication as to where we're all going, as to where we all fit in, because we all do fit in; there's a place here for everyone. And it's just, you know, getting all of these ideas, of getting these people together and showing them that they do have a common interest, which is this University, which is this community. So I think everyone should take part in their community.

It's just—you know, sometimes I feel really bitter because I feel like I've been duped this year, you know, in a lot of ways, and I know I have, you know; I know I have. But there are very few things that I would do very much differently, you know.

Overall, it was a very good year, and, you know, you find these faults out and you find them everywhere, you know. That's just the way people are, you know, and you deal with that. That's the way the system is; you try to deal with that. And I think that little serenity prayer, I think that's—whoever wrote that was one of the wisest people ever. I think this is how it goes: "God grant me the serenity to accept what I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can and the wisdom to know the difference."

In summation, that's what it's all about, you know? It's accepting what you cannot change and trying, having the courage, you know, to give new ideas, to try new and different things, new and different procedures, new and different classes, new and different—you know, just ideas, you know, and yet the wisdom, you know, to know the difference, the wisdom to know what to accept and the wisdom to know what to change. And I think that it's been a very, very—oh, just a tremendous year and I know that I will be a better citizen for it. I hope the University is a better place for my having been here.



---

## ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SENATE *LOUIS TEST, PRESIDENT*

I think everybody, when they came into office, were really apprehensive this year because of the problems that we faced with Governor's Day. We didn't exactly know where we were going and what we were going to do. And, of course, the eruption of Governor's Day really threw everything in a real turmoil. The Jesse Sattwhite case was, of course, just before then and nobody knew exactly what was going to happen so far as Judicial Council was concerned.

And then, the Governor's Day broke loose, which was my first exciting Senate meeting, is when both the—I guess you would say the right wing, or the cowboys, engineers, and the left wing, or the longhairs, or hippies, or whatever you want to call them, showed up in the Senate. People were really worried about it, and I was, too, because I didn't exactly know what was going to happen. But thankfully, the people on the University, the students, the administration, and so forth, really put out their best effort, I think, and tried to discuss things rather than fight about things. I think a lot of good things came out of this meeting

just by the simple fact that it was the first time that the longhairs and the cowboys had ever actually sat down and started talking about something rather than fighting about it and living in their own separate worlds. I think this helped government in some respects because it really put a lot of light on government for a change. Before, it was just there for the Mackay Days, winter carnivals, and so forth. It really didn't have that much influence concerning the actual running of the University.

I think Dan McKinney and Jesse Sattwhite added a lot of interesting insights to this year. I don't think they accomplished anything that they wanted to because they kept talking about trying to unite the students and trying to unite the blacks, and so forth. And from the people I've talked to, including the whites and the blacks, all's they actually did was tear the campus apart more than anything else, which I think was a real—it was a real sorry situation. It really bothered me.

I think something else that happened this year was communications with the Board of

Regents really opened up. I think for the first time the students had a chance to see the Board of Regents on a more personal basis rather than Supreme Lords of the University dictating what's supposed to go on and what's supposed to happen. So I think this was a real asset to the students as well as to the Board of Regents because they got an insight on what was happening on the campus from the student viewpoint rather than just the administration or one elected official.

I think the students may have abused this to a certain extent in the Adamian affair when they tried to take control of the microphones, and so forth. I think this really hurt our position with the Board of Regents because then they were really apprehensive and really leery about letting us ever speak to them again. I think this was demonstrated by their complete lack of wanting to communicate on the Saturday of the Adamian case. We had to fight tooth and nail in order to let them speak (meaning the longhairs, and so forth)—speak to the Board of Regents.

Fortunately, through the combined efforts of the students, of the administration, and of the faculty, the Board of Regents did say, "Okay, we'll at least hear both sides of the story," which I think was a real good move on their part, and I think it was handled really well on both sides in this situation because both agreed to certain rules in certain situations. They conformed to the rules that they had set up themselves, and the Board of Regents went along with it.

I had some new ideas for Senate and some new approaches to Senate. Unfortunately, a lot of these new approaches went by the wayside because of the problems that we had with the Adamian affair, and so forth. But the Senate did make itself a separate entity from the executive branch this year and this is the one thing that I did want to see. I felt that Jim

Hardesty had controlled the Senate too much and run more or less a one-man show when he was up here. But when Frankie Sue came in, she delegated a lot of her power out, I think, to the Senate and tried to make the Senate do something. I worked with her along these lines, and the Senate more or less acted as a working body this year. When problems came up or something had to be done concerning the students' refrigerator, something along these lines, the senators were the ones that went out and did more or less the leg work on a lot of these issues, which I think was a good thing.

The Senate this year also kept the boards on their toes. By this, I mean they questioned their actions instead of just giving blanket approval to the Activities Board and the Finance Control Board and the Pub Board. They questioned what they were doing and how they were doing it, where the money was being spent, why it was being spent here, and I think this is an aid to any government, is when people question what is going on in the government. Sometimes it makes a government look bad, but I think sometimes it is necessary because it keeps them thinking.

One of the most disheartening, I think, events that I had this year was during elections. And I can't help but say it, but I think certain people on this campus felt sour grapes concerning the elections, and they made many accusations on campus against the election boards, and so forth, that weren't founded.

And I think one of the areas, as I mentioned, was the elections, and when they challenged the elections, it was done by a person that really didn't even come from this campus. His name was Bob Allum. And this person came down here on a debate tournament and got involved in the elections, and when the elections turned out (and not



in his favor, I might add) for the people he was campaigning about, he brought more or less charges against the ASUN through Peggy Lear Bowen, and I think Peggy was kind of the scapegoat of the whole mess because she was a student, and I think this Bob Allum used her to further his own ideas and his own purposes. He brought a similar suit like this up against Washington State, and evidently he must have known more than he did when he came to our campus because he didn't check the facts out in the case, and consequently we did win the decision.

After this was done, charges were brought against me for perjury, along with Braden Rippetoe, for supposedly giving false evidence at the hearing concerning the elections. When an investigation was carried out by the Student Affairs staff, the charges were dropped, and doing a little bit of research on my own, I found out that one of the main reasons for these charges, again, instituted by Bob Allum and Peggy Bowen, was to try to get the case thrown out, or the decision thrown out, because by supposedly presenting false evidence and false testimony at a trial, if it's used in that decision, then they can throw out the entire case and have another retrial. I think this was a motive that they were trying to use. It wasn't anything personal against me or Braden, I don't feel. But it was more to get another chance to win their case. And this really makes me mad because I think people are nit-picking and people are playing sour grapes. They're saying, "Well, if I can't win, then I'm going to see that nobody else does anything." And this really hurts the University in all aspects. When people cannot accept the majority rule, is what it amounts to, when they think that, "I'm right and—I'm right. Since I'm right, everybody else has to go along with me," and this just isn't the situation.

I think one of the problems that student government faced this year was this nit-picking by people in a lot of respects. People are always too anxious to tear things down rather than try and build on things. When we'd have ideas, you know, to try and improve things (like in the Senate, I had ideas of revising the statutes to make the committee systems work in the Senate), unfortunately, every time you turn around, there would be another issue, and somebody would be trying to tear something down, so you wouldn't have time to work on these things. I wanted to see if we could get the statutes in for the new Senate. Unfortunately, a month before the new Senate came in, they brought charges against the elections; consequently, we had to work on the elections, and we didn't have time to work on the Senate statutes. So I think if people would try and work with what they have and try and build on what they have rather than tearing down what they have, I think they're going to get a lot further. But this, again, is a personal feeling, but it's something I think the students have got to realize, like that Board of Regents situation. We had a perfect opportunity there to present our ideas and get our ideas across to the Board of Regents. But unfortunately, people were more interested in tearing down this opportunity and actually abusing the opportunity we had here to communicate with the Regents than trying to build on it. They weren't willing to work together.

Dan McKinney was an extremely good example of this. I talked to Dan, and Frankie Sue had talked to Dan, and we said, "Dan, we want to have some idea from the blacks and the black problems that are facing the campus, and we would appreciate, you know, if you'd come in, we can sit down and we can present a proposal to the Board of Regents concerning the blacks on campus."

Well, Dan refused to come in and talk to us. He just refused to. He said he would do it his own way, and like I say, here was a golden opportunity for Dan, of all people, to sit down with the head people of the University and see if he could actually get something done for the blacks. But he just threw it away. It just makes me—well, not mad, but it frustrates me more than anything else, which again then makes you mad in the long run. But these are things we kept facing. Time after time after time, the people just would not sit down and try and build with what we had. They were just more interested in tearing down what we had.

I think the Experimental College; when it was under Dan Tegli, was more interested in tearing down than building up in a lot of respects. Jonathan Andrews, I think he's going to do a good job with it because he is actually interested more in the new teaching techniques, and so forth, where I think Dan was more interested in Dan, in getting his name out in front of the public, and so forth. But these, I guess, are human hang-ups you just got to face them and work with. But it's a shame when you want to do so much and nobody will let you do it.

The Interim Code was really a funny situation because they just imposed it on us, and nobody really understood what it was or what was happening with it. They completely did away with the Judicial Council. They did away with the Referrals Board, and that one section of the constitution was just deleted.

Fortunately, the Board of Regents more or less let us handle our own procedure until the code was actually finalized, which was a good move on their part, I think, because it gave the students still a feeling of judging their own peers through the Judicial Council. It removed the Referrals Board, which was a hindrance in some respects, but yet it placed it, and Dean Kinney, who I think is a real good

man, a very competent man. He understands the students real well, so he understood the problems that we were facing with the Interim Code and Judicial Council. So it worked out real well, I think, fortunately, like I say, because of the man more than anything else. And he more or less run the things the way we wanted to.

The code itself met with a lot of unrest on campus because of the way that it was imposed. A lot of people said that it was unfair and that it didn't give the students their rights, and so forth, which is true so far as the drawing up of the document. But with further research, we found that, actually, the code was just exactly what we had in our constitution and what the faculty had really in their contracts, and so forth. So there wasn't that much of a change. It was more or less codifying everything that they did have before.

I think that the Board of Regents could have talked to the students, could have talked to the administration, and so forth, and at least let us know what was going on and what was happening without just springing it on us like this. But I think it did do something again to us. It made us wake up, so far as students, to realize that the Board of Regents did have the ultimate power in situations like this, and if we were going to get anything done, we had to take on the responsibility and do the work so that we could present different ideas, and so forth, to the Board.

I think Dean Sam and Janice Miller worked real hard on getting proposals. They wrote many drafts, and changed them and rewrote them, and so forth, until they finally got something that was pretty much a compromise on everybody's part, including the Board of Regents. Then when it was presented to the Board of Regents, I think we had the knowledge and the background



so that we could argue with such proposals as Mr. Bell's, which more or less took all the decision making power out of the students and the faculty and placed it in the hearing officer.

Now, from what I understand, they still have a hearing officer, but this person is more or less for advisory purposes rather than for a judgment purpose, which I think is necessary in any type of judicial hearing. You have to have some type of legal assistance in this area, so I think this is a good idea. Like I say, the Board of Regents came through on this one for us. And they worked with us; they understood the problems I think we were facing.

Something that didn't turn out quite as well as we wanted it to was the athletic proposal. Now this, again, was presented to the Board of Regents, but I think there was a lot of politics going on behind the scenes concerning the athletic proposal on the Board of Regents, but I don't think there was quite as much concerning the Judicial Council. I think the Judicial Council, they were leaving everything pretty much in our hands, as faculty and students; and with the athletic proposal, I think everything was pretty well taken out of our hands before we even got there. I know I've seen Regent Morris talking to Dr. Libke in the legislature and places like this, and I know that they must have been talking about Dr. Libke's athletic proposal of completely taking the funds out of the ASUN. So I think we got a good compromise on it, considering the problems we were facing, considering the politics that was going on in other places. The compromise that we got was a good one.

I think that if we can get a board created with equal representation of students and faculty, I think we'll be able to be more or less control—well, not control, but at least

have a word on where our funds are going in this area, since they are taking it from the students. I think it's a shame that we can't use these funds for bonds, and so forth, because they have been taken out of our hands and placed in the athletic department now. But this is something I think we are going to have to live with now that it is done and see what we can do working through this board. Because I am sure there can be some type of a workable situation, even with the board, concerning these funds, that we may be able to place some type of bond, retirement, or something, on the funds that we do gain on this more or less insurance. It will be difficult, I think, but I think if we need it for such things as student union expansion or things along these lines, the board will go along with us so far as insurance and bonding. But this is something, like I say, that will be told in the future, and I think we have got most of our facts and information together. I think the athletic department is pretty well satisfied with the proposals, so maybe we can sit down now and start talking again on what we can do with the funds rather than knocking heads together on where the funds are to go. And this is what it got down to toward the end, was just them against us, and there was no grounds in between. And I think now, we got a place to work on the funds and see if we can get something done with them.

I think the students are really divided on the athletic question in general. It's something like the yearbook. You know, nobody cares about the yearbook as long as they're getting it. But as soon as you threaten that you're going to take it away from them, then they all get up in arms. This happened last year. Over 3,000 people signed up for the yearbook, and before, we couldn't give 2,000 away.

The interest in athletics, I think, is going to drop because it's just there and everybody

knows it and they just take it for granted. But I think when you start saying that you're going to cut out this or you're going to do away with this or you're going to do this, then the people start taking interest and then they realize it's there again. I think this is going to have some effect on the gate receipts that they get at the games. But I think it's going to come mainly from the people downtown more than from the people on campus itself because there is a lot of things going on up here, and there is a lot of other interest that people have other than athletics right now. They can go home and they can watch it on television rather than going up and watching it in the football arena and freeze to death, and things along these lines.

So I think as far as the college athletics scene is going, if you're big time, I think you'll have some draw, and Reno has always been a winning team town. Unless you have a winning team, they don't show up. you can see with the Reno Aces and their problems this year. You can see with the Silver Sox, back on the days when they were winning, they'd have big crowds. Now they can't even hardly fill one side of the bleachers. And I think this is something that the University of Nevada is going to have to face. They're going to have to have winning teams if they are going to draw. This way, the students will also take an interest. But I don't think you're going to see the University getting rid of athletics, because as soon as you say it, then everybody is going to get up in arms.

I think the alcoholic beverage policy is a good one. It took us a long time to get it through, but I think it straightened out—well, not straightened out, but I'll say got rid of the dualism that we had on campus concerning the summer courses and the regular courses during the fall and winter. I think it's going to work out. I think you can see by the Judicial

Council, the number of cases that have been brought up in front of the Judicial Council, and they're about the same as they did before. There isn't too much change in the number. It isn't legalizing drinking but I think admitting that it's here, and this is something that I think people have just got to realize. You can see it at Mackay Day and all the other times that it's going on. But it gives the students a little more feeling of responsibility. I think with the voting being dropped to eighteen, I think it's going to have a great influence on the drinking policy on the University, because I'm pretty sure when they drop the voting age, if they drop the voting age to eighteen, they'll probably lower the age for buying beer, probably "three-two" beer, and I think this could lead to definite possibilities of having a pub on campus or something along these lines, which could be a lot of fun for everybody. Because—you know, I don't think they'll get drunk in a situation like this because the pub will be more or less a place to exchange ideas and to talk about things rather than just going out and getting ripped. If they want to do this, I think they'll go down to Leo's Den or the PO or something along these lines, because it's more of a place where it's not the campus.

Concerning the 4-4-1, I think this is where you ran into the staunch, conservative professors again that had their lesson plans set up and everything ready to go and they don't particularly want to change. And I think they can see the advantages in the 4-4-1, but I also think that they feel that the students are going to do this last—or this one month in between, just to have run rather than to do any studying. And, of course, they have been having enough problems as it is right now with contracts, salaries, and so forth (especially from the state legislature, and the governor, for that matter), concerning

the number of hours that they are teaching, and I think this was another consideration in the back of their minds, was the contracts (those two reasons being more or less staunch conservative), and having their lesson plans all set up, and so forth, and the fact that the number of hours that they're working, the contract problems that they'll run into switching to a 4-4-1. And I guess another they might also consider are the problems of labs, 'cause labs are set up now that usually run two, three hours. And they really can't change their labs, because if you add ten minutes on lab, it isn't going to make that much difference as to what they do, and the numbers will be cut down on the labs.

So I think these were the three main objections that I could hear so far as the teachers were concerned. And I think change will come. I think it lost by fifteen votes last time, so I think that the 4-4-1 should change—or the system should change to a 4-4-1 in the future. I think Danny has got this in the back of his mind, too, because it's a real pain to come back after Christmas vacation for two or three weeks and worry about finals and papers, and so forth.



---

## BLACK STUDENTS UNION

### *GEORGE COTTON, CO-CHAIRMAN*

The Black Students Union was started, began in 1968 in the fall. And it was organized by the black students on campus to act as a service organization to black students in the University community as well as the high school students and the blacks and other minority groups in the communities in the Reno-Sparks area. And the first officers were Lloyd Walker as chairman, and the executive board consisted of Lincoln Williams, Alex Boyd, Marilyn Plummer, Heather Barnes and Jesse Sattwhite at this time.

The organization was quite active. During its '68, '69 years, it did go around to the various high schools and give talks, and many times it was invited to the Reno High School Black Cultural Club, which is at this time established at Reno High School by black students over there, and they gave talks on subjects from Ethnic Studies to Black History, Black Involvement, Black Awareness and Living Black History, and they also tried to enlist black students to attend the University by different means of recruitment.

Then in '69, the fall of '69, the Black Students Union was chaired by George Hardaway; co-chairman, George Cotton; secretary was Marilyn Plummer; treasurer was Melvin Henry; and the executive board member from the body was Heather Barnes. And by the way, Heather was chairman at first, but she did resign. And during this time, we brought in speakers from different campuses in California. We took trips to see what other black students' unions were doing around the area, and we also tried to get involved in recruitment of different students, minority students from other areas, and we tried to work closely with the newly formed Educational Opportunities Program under the direction of John West.

In the spring of '69, which was the first administration, we had a Black Week in February, the second week of February (it was the fourteenth through the twenty-first that year), and we had speakers then. We had a soul food dinner, we had a concert, fashion shows, talent shows, and things to make people aware of what black people did

and what they enjoy doing, and to give them an insight on black culture.

In the beginning of the fall of '69, as I said, we had the election of the new officers. We weren't very active per se for the fall semester. We gave a few social functions and we were mainly working with getting the black group organized, getting speakers lined up and getting funded for the spring semester. And we had a few conflicts with authorities downtown, the police, supposedly that—allegedly, as they said, hassling black students and problems that black students were having with their profs as far as grades went. We were able to solve these through mediation between the various groups that we had to deal with. And this worked out pretty well for the time being, but we still found that the police did assert some sort of prejudice against blacks. During this time we were having problems with the cowboy faction on campus because some black young men were going with white females because this was—you know, just something that is done in other places in the nation. But being as Reno is supposedly known as the Mississippi of the West and supposed to be fifteen years behind the rest of the country, this can be expected from this place.

In the spring of 1969, we started—I mean the spring of 1970, we started to really get the ball rolling as far as Black Week went and getting students aware, getting students involved with different programs. We started going over to Hug High School at nights to the Black Studies class they had over there to give talks and lectures. It was actually a club, but they conducted it in the form of a class and they asked Black Students Union to send personnel over to discuss different issues with them and give our expertise on different angles of black history.

This year we had our Black Week in April, I believe, the last week in April. "We had the Black Week then, and this week was highly successful. We had Harry, Dr. Harry Edwards here; we had many poets; black poets from the Bay area came down to give talks. Our week was ended with a Billy Preston concert and a dance along with that. It was the very last thing we did. It was very interesting, and highly enlightening to many students on campus. We got a lot of feedback from the students on campus on our Black Week. It made them aware of a lot of things and black history that they never knew existed.

And also in the fall of '69 and the spring of '70, we had speakers coming in. We had the black ambassador, ex-ambassador from Ghana. We had Dr. St. Claire Drake and we got these speakers in and we gave them cocktail parties and different functions which were highly successful. We did this with the aid of Dr. Ben Hazzard, Professor Ben Hazzard, who was here in the art department last year who is now working with an art gallery in Paris. Also during this year, Julian Bond, the black assemblyman from Georgia, came and he talked on campus.

That evening Dr. N. Edd Miller, president of the University, gave a cocktail party at his home and we of the Black Students Union were invited. At first we weren't invited—let me clarify—and Mr. Sattwhite and Mr. McKinney went in to Dr. Miller and demanded representation for the black students at the cocktail party. We were in turn invited by the president and we did receive an apology for his lack of inviting us in the beginning. At this cocktail party, we found that people really were surprised, in that the black students were able to conduct themselves in a manner they—I guess they felt we were animals of some sort that were incapable of acting in a prescribed manner in

public, but they learned a lot from us at this time. We had discussions. Different groups, you know, were discussing different things, different problems with the black students, and I think this helped to enlighten a lot of people that we did have a black segment on campus and that they were working and trying to get something accomplished.

Okay, that's a brief and broad outline of what happened from '68 to '70. Now, in the year of 1970 and the fall of '70 and the spring of 1971, which has not concluded yet, we had extensive programs, especially in the fall. Starting out in the fall, we began by going to a Black History class taught by Mrs. Arma Mack over at Hug High School. She invited us to come in and talk to her students, and we learned from each other because Hug High does have an extensive Black Studies Library as far as encyclopedias, different books by black poets, black authors are concerned. We were able to get books from this and also bring books of our own to add to this, to help enlarge this library and give the students more of an insight on black awareness.

During the fall, we began planning for Black Week, and this year our Black Week was—we felt that instead of working just something that was going to be up on campus, we would work with the entire community with this Black Week, and that we might not even have anything on campus. We were supposed to have displays in the library, but this didn't even come about. And I'll get into that in a minute. But in the fall semester, we had our usual social functions, dances, fundraising things to enlighten the people as far as what the black students were trying to do and what they were going to do. We had trouble with the Finance Control Board and Activities Board as far as getting funding for our Black Week because they gave us a total of \$1,500.00, and we had asked for I guess

altogether around \$7,000 to put on for fall and spring semesters together. And this would have allowed us to put on an outstanding Black Week if we had gotten these funds to get good name speakers in and—you know, different things of sort. Then we had some problems, internal problems with the Union, and we kind of got ourselves—not apart, but we weren't really together for a while there. But we did get back together at the end of that semester. And during this time, we found that our \$1,500.00 had been cut due to some negligence on the part of some of our members in the BSU.

Then in the spring we began to work with the Race Relations Center in Reno and the different local organizations, as well as Washoe County School Board in regards to getting the Black Week established, and instead of saying this was the Black Student Union Black Week, we just worked during the regular Black Week time and took people around to talk at schools and things, and this Black Week involved having high-ranking officers from the armed services come in and go around to different schools in the district and explain their jobs. We were trying to strive for a living history. And myself and a couple of other members of the Black Student Union went around to the different area high schools, elementary schools, and junior high schools to give talks on black awareness, black problems, and answer any questions that the students might have.

And just a note, a point of discussion in this, the major points, questions we were asked were those concerning the Black Panther Party, for some reason. We found that the students had heard numerous stories, you know, that the Black Panthers were ogres and people who were taboo and you didn't have any[thing] to do with them because they were animals of sort. But we tried to



explain to them some of the good things that the Panthers had done in regards to their "Operation Breadbasket," and feeding the children in the ghettos and trying to help to educate them, make them aware of black history as well as the regular living history and studies, and that which the regular curriculum in schools went for.

Okay, and during this year, at the end of this week, we had a forum of sorts that myself and the chairman of the Union at this time, Dan McKinney, were invited to sit on a board to explain what we thought of this week and—you know, how we were going about extending it. And the major consensus of the entire board was we hoped this wasn't a method of pacification on the part of Reno in giving the black people one week out of the year to deal with their problems and learn about black problems and become aware of things concerning the blacks. We expressed this hope, and I think that we might be able to show some effects that it has worked out in the long run.

And going back to the fall of 1969, there was one thing that I did leave out. The black students as a whole, mainly the athletic department, we decided we did need a black coach on campus to help the black athletes better to relate to someone, because as most people know, when you're an athlete, the main person you will go to see when you have problems if you're not at home where you can go to your parents or your father, you do go to your coach because he is a person you can sit down and talk to, and he'll tell it to you like it is, in most cases. And a black student finds it hard to relate to a white man in respect to his personal problems that happen to him because he is black. Whereas a white man can sympathize, he cannot understand, where a black coach can understand the problems because he has most likely done these things

himself. And he can sympathize with you and perhaps give you some sort of a means to eradicate your problem. Okay, and that's—I guess that will end the fall of '69.

In the spring of this year, one of the major things that we've done that I'm quite proud of is the campus orientation that was set up for poor students (academic and monetary) I tried to get it for the Indian, black, and Mexican-Americans, about twenty-five Indian students and a large amount of minority students from Hug High School. And the thing that made me and the Union be concerned in this was that when the regular school had their campus orientation for seniors, we noticed there were very few blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Indians, and we felt that there was something that should be done about this. So at this time I was assigned to go in and talk to John Halvorson, Director of Admissions, and he told me he was thinking about cutting out that entire senior orientation program because he couldn't see whether it was doing any good or not. So I asked him, well, was there any way that we could perhaps get—have another day and get up black students, Mexican-Americans, and Indians from three high schools. And he said they had no funding, and he said he didn't see any percentage in actually having another day just for these students because they show no interest.

So I saw that I probably wouldn't be able to get anyplace with him so I decided I'd go to the high schools and do some research. And from talking to the counselors at the area high schools, it wasn't only the minority students that didn't sign up for this program, it was a vast majority of the Caucasian and other students, also. They just didn't know in the beginning what the program was about, and then when they came up at the last minute, it was too late to really do something about this.



So then at this time I decided I would try to get an orientation for these students in some way, by going through the school districts if I had to get funding from ASUN, or have the BSU sponsor it ourselves, by ourselves.

I talked to Ken Vaughn, the counselor over at Hug High School, and we came up with the program of perhaps getting sophomores and juniors, and I noted I had seen this done at Monterey Peninsula College in California where they started with eighth grade students and start bringing them up to the college campus to give them some sort of incentive to further their education. So at this time I tried to contact the various high schools and I had other people working to contact the other high schools to try to get the permission with the principals to run this program, and the only schools that seemed to be willing to give any cooperation were Hug High School and Wooster, and in the end, we ended up with about ninety-one students from Hug High School. Wooster and Reno, we were unable to get any from. I believe this is probably because I couldn't follow it up myself and explain the program fully because we had to work through Pat Miltenberger with Upward Bound, and she was trying to coordinate her program at the same time. So we ran into some difficulties.

However, in dealing with Hug High School at first, I found everything quite receptive. I explained to Ken Vaughn that I would open it up. Instead of just saying "for black students or minority students," I would open it up to all students. But I would appreciate having a large degree of blacks on this program because they are the ones that we really are trying to recruit, black students, to give them that incentive not to drop out of high school and to try to further their education to make it in college. And in this way, they'll know no one can tell you to get

back because you're not qualified. We want to teach them to get trained and qualified so they can make it in this society of ours.

And in this program, which was to go off on the sixth of May (that was a Thursday), I was supposed to bring the students. We were going to bring the students up to campus. And we were having problems with busses, getting busses, transportation, but we were finally able to work all this out. On the fourth of May, I went over to Hug High School to get the list of students that would be coming up in the program, and by checking the list I found that I had seventy-one students on the list. And I only had about eight blacks out of the entire group. So I went to Ken Vaughn and tried to find out what the problem was. So he said, "Well, you know, they just didn't bring them back (permission slips)."

Well, to me, this was totally unacceptable, and I talked to the students, and they said that the instructors were just picking the students they wanted to go up on this orientation and they would do it like that. So I asked Ken, I said, "Well, I might try to get three or four more students and put them in this, under this program." And he said okay. You know, he figured I'd only come with three or four students, and I could sign them off.

So in the meantime I had talked to Bob Scott, the principal, and he told me he would support me in my program in any way that he could, so I went and I was able to get twenty more blacks, which was the total—almost the total population of the sophomore and junior classes at Hug, because most of them are seniors, the blacks over there. So I was able to get this, and I ended up with ninety-one students.

And in this orientation we brought them up and we went around to some classes. We were invited to some classes after we had an orientation. President Miller gave the

welcome address and we had John Halvorson [from] Admissions there. Dr. McQueen, John West was there. Mr. Jackson was there from Financial Aid, and we tried to give them a general jist of what they needed to have to come to the University.

And one of the high points to me of the orientation day, visitation day, was we were able to go to some classes and went to an economics class on the black ghetto. And the professor invited the black students that I had with me (which was twelve) to come and just be a part of the class and speak up when they needed to. Being young, you know, young students, mostly sophomores, I felt that I was going to be dealing with someone that would just get mad and get up and start screaming and getting obnoxious and be saying a lot of irrelevant things. But we found that they were able to talk on a quite sophisticated, highly sophisticated level with the college students, and they brought up a lot of valid points and enlightened a lot of the students in the class. And this—I was really impressed by the reactions of the professor and the reactions of the students and the way my students that I had brought in acted. And this was really the high point to me.

But what really made it set the thing off and made it work out real fine, from talking to Dr. Miller and Mr. Halvorson afterwards, we found that they were impressed, and I'll have to go through some more consultations with them, but we might be able to expand this program to all four high schools and have a special visitation day for sophomores, a special day for juniors, and if they wish to continue the day for seniors (which I feel is not definitely necessary because when you're a senior, you've got your mind made up one way or the other), they will be able to do this. And next year we might have to operate on smaller levels, perhaps fifty students from each high

school, but it is a start and step. I'm glad to see that the Black Students Union did do this.

And right now, for the ending out of this year, the BSU is right now, we're scheduling, we're getting our calendar together for next fall; we're budgeting for next fall and trying to get everything together for the fall and spring semesters. And throughout this year and the summer we will be trying to better community relations between the University community and the local black community in northeast Reno and the outlying areas. This will help us to indeed be able to act as a service organization not only to the blacks, but also to whites, because we have been asked to attend speaking engagements for different organizations, and this way we might be able to have a going thing to help all the people in this area, as far as the Black Student Union is concerned.

In my mind, the black role on campus, as far as the population of blacks, it has begun to increase. This is due to the large influx of the coaches bringing in black athletes because—not just to be bragging on the black athlete—however, any school that wants to have a winning program in athletics seems, and any schools that do have the winning programs seem to have a majority of their athletes as blacks. I guess it's just the proudness of the black man or he has to work harder in athletics because this is the only way he can, in most cases, express himself in order to come into the school system and get this education, because in most cases the high schools and schools as a whole that he has to go to are quite inadequate in regards to giving him the educational background so that he can come in on academic scholarships and different things.

The things that has really hurt this campus as a whole that makes us lose blacks every year is that there is a very low amount of black

nonathletic students here. Everyone here is usually on some sort of athletic scholarship or waiver. We have very few programs to recruit black students that aren't athletes. These are mainly for instate students, and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas campus will take—since a majority of the black students are there, they do get the majority of black students that we would be getting here normally, if there wasn't a university down there, because they have something to offer them in regards to black studies, curriculums. They have black professors at Las Vegas campus. They have ten black professors; two of them are Ph.D's. The Reno campus, we have none. This is something we should be striving for. In regards to that, we have started negotiations with the Regents and we have talked to Mr. Bilbray and Mrs. Helen Thompson, two Regents that are from Vegas, in regards to getting a black professor on campus in the history department, hopefully to start us toward getting our—to get a Black Studies program because the Vegas campus is many years behind us as far as being in existence. But in regards to study, the Black Studies programs and different curriculums there, they're about ten years ahead of us. And this is something we should check into because it's quite visible, and it's kind of a shame, a disgrace. This University has been here since 1862, and here it is over a hundred years, and we've had one black professor who is not here with us any more and no Black Studies program. We have an Ethnic Studies program here, but I feel that it is inadequate due to the fact that it doesn't have a qualified black instructor or ethnic instructor; I believe it's not. But if there's anything to do with the Indian organizations, it's not taught by an Indian; blacks is not taught by a black; Mexican-American, it is not taught by Mexican-Americans. And they would be the

people that would have the background in it, naturally as well as educational-wise, if they come in with their credentials in Black Studies or Ethnic Studies per se. So this is something we should check out, also.

And another major gripe about the campus here as a whole, and even in this city, we have a low degree of black females; but on the campus as a whole we have seventy-four blacks including the Africans on campus and there are ten females, ten black females on campus. The ratio there is not very good, and I feel that the University or someone should try to initiate some sort of programs to recruit black females here, not just to keep the black males from going out with the white females. I know this would probably be the major idea or the reason for the cowboys or whatever different factions to push this, but I feel that this is something that is definitely needed, and desperately needed, because they can add a lot to the campus, as well as adding a lot to the ego of the black male on campus.

Two weeks ago we held elections for the Black Students Union new officers for the fall semester. And the new officers are: chairman, Emerson Davis; co-chairman, James Willis; secretary, Helen White; and treasurer, Quintin Carey. We have an executive board consisting of five other people which are these people: Nathan Appleton, Barbara Butler, George Cotton, John Jackson, Eric Fuller; and that rounds out the Executive Committee. We will be having one—appointing or electing one more—or two more people to the committee (and that will be two more females to make the ratio a little bit better, you know) so we can have both sides of any argument, which will be three and three in the executive committee.

And the goals of the new Black Students Union officers are to help to motivate the black students on campus to become involved in the organization. We have been known, we

have gone from one extreme to the other since we've been on campus. When we first came in, we were known as a party-social organization. Then we went to the extreme of being a radical, terrorizing, militant organization, as far as the whites were concerned. From what I read in the *Sagebrush*, you know, that's what we were supposedly known to be. Now we're hoping to be able to work with the ASUN government, the community, and the powers that be over the University to achieve our goals, which are black unity, to act as a great service to black students, incoming black students and the students as a whole, black or white. If there's something that we have something, know something about, we will be willing to give our assistance in any way we can. And we just feel that if we can function, you know, if the previous stated goal that I stated at the beginning of this—these officers feel that they will be the ones that can give the people the incentive to come out to the meetings and to participate and be very active in the Black Students Union.

---

## BOARD OF REGENTS

### *HAROLD JACOBSEN, CHAIRMAN*

This is Harold Jacobsen, chairman of the Board of Regents as of January 1, 1971. Really, I am fairly new at this particular position because I've only served the last four months, but I would like to start out by reflecting on some of the things that's happened in the last eight years that I have served on the Board of Regents at the University of Nevada.

In 1962 when I first took office, there were nine Regents elected from the three districts, three from Las Vegas, three from Reno, and three from the rest of the state. And there was a president, University President Charles Armstrong. He had a vice president and several people that were in executive capacity without title. Shortly after I got on the board, Neil Humphrey was named the financial vice president, so we had two vice presidents, and then, not too long after that, we named the head of the DRI, Wendell Mordy at the time, the vice president for DRI.

The University was growing very rapidly at that time and we found that the so-called branch of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas was no longer a branch and it was

really a university in itself. And we felt—that is, all the Regents, I'm sure, felt that we had to create some autonomy for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. And so rather than to just go at it without checking out the best way to do it (and this was four years ago; it would be 1967), we decided that we would bring in people from other university systems and have them tell us how they did it. And so we had representatives from Oregon and California and some of the Eastern states and some of the midwestern states and we had returned questionnaires from many, many states that told us how their university systems operated. And then we created the University of Nevada system as it's known today. It's kind of grown, because at first there were just the two presidents and the chancellor, and now we have the head man of the DRI, Dr. Ward, is also a president and we have the head of the Community College system, the president of his system.

As I look back at this, there was one campus, University of Nevada, Reno, and another campus that was sort of a branch

of the University of Nevada. There was no community college or junior college system at all in the state of Nevada, and there was no way of offering any type of training other than to get the academic degree. And so about 1967, we took over Stead Air Force Base and created the Nevada Technical Institute. Nevada Technical Institute offered courses with terminal degrees in one year, and most of them, of course, in two years, and there were some transfer courses. And this, although it is a good theory, didn't prove out to be the real answer to the problem. The problem, of course, was that all of the students that graduated from high school really weren't academic material. They weren't college material. They weren't the kind that wanted to get the four-year degree, that wanted to go on and be doctors and lawyers, and so forth, beyond the four-year degree. Really, what they wanted was to get some training that wasn't offered in high school and that they did need before they got into industry. And so we had to figure another way to do it. And the new answer, of course, came out in the community college system.

When I first filed for this office back eight, nine years ago now, I made a statement that I felt that Nevada should do something about the fact that they were the only state out of the fifty that did not have either a junior college or a community college system. And I campaigned on this issue. The people from the small counties seem to recognize the need for it more than they did from Reno and Las Vegas. That may have been, of course, that the spokesmen from the more urban areas were more academically orientated. It wasn't necessarily because the people—that is, the majority of the people felt that way, but that wasn't true about the small counties. They recognized the need. They're probably better in touch with some of their students and

the need, and they were willing to back that type of an education. A few years later, Elko started their Community College on their own, and then when Paul Laxalt got to be governor, he, in his campaign, said that he would advocate a community college system, which, of course, pleased me no end because I've been advocating it right along. At that time, I, too, made a statement in my campaign that that would be one of the main things I would work for.

So now we have a chancellor who heads the University system and he represents the Board of Regents on their level. Actually, he's the one who interprets policy and financing, does the lobbying at the legislature and sees to it that when the Board of Regents are not in session, there is some place to go to find out what the policy really is. In other words, if there is a problem on either one of the campuses, or in one of the other arms of the University, then the answer should come from the chancellor's office. And if the answer isn't correct, then it's brought up at the next Board of Regents meeting where policy is changed.

We also made our Regents' duties more productive. Let's say that we had some reason and rhyme attached to the way that we operated. Instead of just going to a meeting with an agenda, we set up a procedure whereby in order for particular items to come to the agenda, they had to be approved by the head of that particular arm of the University. In other words, if it came from the Community College, then Dr. Donnelly would have to approve it before it gets on the agenda. And if it came from the University of Nevada, Reno, it would have to be approved by Dr. Miller. And this led to cutting down on the amount of material that came before the Regents. There also has set it up so that we must have a recommendation from the head of a college or department before we'll take



any action, and although this doesn't work in all cases, in many cases it streamlines the action of the board.

We used to operate on a committee system, then the committees would come back and make recommendations to the board. And this worked out pretty good for a while, but it got so that we were taking a lot more time in committees, and the board is composed of people who make their living doing something else. We just have the time we donate to being a Regent. It comes out of our incomes, really. And so we wanted it so that we would really be doing something while we were there, and that's why we streamlined the actions. Now, when we get a recommendation, we are able to hear both sides, and anybody else who wants to testify can come in and testify in a short period of time. We can get through an agenda that would have taken us a week a few years ago, now in a day and a half or two days. We meet once a month. We used to meet four times a year. I understand back when the University first started, they met something like four times a year, or twice a year. So there's a big change now in the operation of the University. I think we've grown up and I believe that the system as it's set up now is probably the most efficient one in the United States. I really believe that we have the best system of higher education around because we have incorporated all education beyond the high school level in the University of Nevada system. And there's no hodge-podge, there's no arguments before the legislature on which way to spend the money. It takes politics out of the way the money is appropriated. We do have some arguments among ourselves, but when the recommendations finally come to the legislature, they understand the feeling of the members of the board.

And also, the Board of Regents has been reapportioned. I mentioned earlier how it's set up. Up until this session of the legislature, there have been eleven members. There has been five of them from Las Vegas and there has been three from each of the other two districts. So there's three from Washoe County, three from the rest of the state, for a total of eleven, which gave a balance of power outside of Clark County, and as this tape is being made, as of yesterday, I understand that there are now nine members of the Board of Regents, and the balance of power now is in Clark County. There would be five from Clark County and two from the small counties and two from Washoe County. I believe that's how it's going to work out. There will be four, yes.

Okay, now maybe I ought to tell you a little about some of the things that has happened at the University, other than in the way it's set up. There were very little participation when I first went on the board from anyone other than just the Regents and the president, some of the administrators, and once in a while we'd hear from a dean, and we always heard, of course, from the business manager, and we heard about the new building we proposed, and we worked with the Planning Board, and things like that. But there was really very little done on the Board of Regents actually involving other people in the operation of the University. Contrast that with today, and where we don't have a Regents' meeting unless we have present representative of the faculty from each campus, and a representative for the faculty from the DRI, and representative of the faculty of the community colleges, and representative of the employees who are the professional employees who are not really in any one of the faculties. Really, they represent the people who work for the system, and that is under Chancellor Neil Humphrey. In addition to that, we have at least two student

representatives from each university. So far, we haven't had any from the community colleges, but we're hoping to involve someone from there if we can get them interested to come. They sit with the board—not on the board, but they sit in at our meeting so that they can hear what is going on, and they're always welcome to speak on any issue. We do say that the spokesman for each one of the groups that I've just outlined have to introduce anyone else that talks. In other words, if the students are having a problem such as they just had on the athletic fee situation, the president called upon the business manager, Jon Wellinghoff (I'm not sure that's his title, but anyhow—), and if the faculty has someone that's really interested in this particular phase of faculty thinking, then he gets a chance to talk. For example, the president of the AAUP spoke at our meeting day before yesterday. So we now have a more knowledgeable public than we had before.

We wondered if there was going to be press there or not the first meeting I went to. Sometimes there would be no representatives of the press. And looking back over the 1962 minutes, I saw where then chairman, Archie Grant, made a comment that at Las Vegas there was no press at all in attendance at the meetings. And now, we don't have too much problem with the press not being there. We usually have one from each one of the papers and usually one from one of the Las Vegas papers here. And when we were in Las Vegas, there will be the other way around, two from Las Vegas and one from here. And always TV people. They come in and get statements from certain people and they take photographs, and then the two student newspapers have generally kept someone there. So our press coverage is real good. Both campuses have public relations people who handle releases, and that helps our image with the public. I say

that with tongue in cheek because our public relations hasn't always been as best it could.

And I was looking back over this last year. We started out—let's go back to September, 1970. We had just had a meeting the month before. We told the president to tell Dr. Adamian, Dr. Paul Adamian, that he could not teach until after his hearing was over with. Well, Dr. Adamian had been using every possible means of postponing the hearing until school was in session. Actually because he wanted to be a martyr. He felt that his case wasn't too strong and maybe he could get the students and some of the faculty to think that we were picking on him, which I want to emphasize was not the case. We didn't pick on any particular one. We asked the administration to select those people who they felt had caused the problems on Governor's Day, the demonstrations and disruptions that happened on Governor's Day, and to bring them forth, to prove that they weren't taking a position of leadership. And there was only one other professor that was brought forth, and we elected before ever having a hearing to say that we didn't feel that there was enough evidence against him. But the evidence was overwhelmingly against Dr. Adamian, so he was brought to trial.

In the case of the students—well, actually, in the case of the students, there wasn't any evidence presented. The Dean of Students and Dean of Men made some formal charges but didn't appear at the students' meetings to press them, and because of the lack of leadership and the know-how to handle these things, the students said that no one was guilty and nothing came of what the students' actions were, I think because of the failing on our part. But yet on the other hand, there were students that—perhaps they learned their lesson because of the fact that they were brought out and asked what they were doing. Anyhow, because of the Governor's Day



happenings—and I'm sure someone else will tell you what happened on that. Probably you ought to have Regent Procter Hug, who was then chairman, tell you more about this because he could tell you the whole story. He was the chairman at the time.

Because of the Governor's Day, we adopted what we called the Interim [Code] rules of conduct. These weren't just dreamed up, because almost two years prior to that, the Regents had asked the faculties of both campuses and the students to come up with some ideas on a code of conduct. And they were never forthcoming, and this, mostly because of those—that type of a body (that is, faculty or student body) just doesn't move that fast, and we knew that we needed something, so we adopted the rules and said that between June and December they would have a chance to amend them. And so they, during that period of time, came up with amendments. Well, we didn't really feel that it would be done by December, but we had set a deadline so something would be done.

And then we had our first hearings. We had three full day committee hearings of the committee of the whole, we call it. That's the committee where all of the Regents are members of the committee, and it is chaired by the vice chairman of the Board of Regents. At this particular moment, it's Paul McDermott. And prior to that it was Tom Bell. And the reason for using the committee that way is it's a more relaxed situation where we can go into a little bit more depth and we can have some better discussions than we would in a regular Regents' meeting. Then after the discussions are over, the results of the committee as a whole are adopted by the Board of Regents in the final form, and that is how the policy is set. We used this, the code of conduct (and I'll get into that in a minute), on other developments in the University.

To get back to this Interim Code of Conduct, it became, then, a sort of a political football. One candidate for office said it was great and then said it was bad, and the students felt that we had taken advantage of them, and I'm sure there were some leading from the faculty on this. The faculty said that they should have been able to develop a code of conduct. Most everybody lost sight of the fact that they had had two years to do something about a code of conduct and had done nothing on it and that we had to have something. But as things cooled off, the so-called Adamian affair got over with, then with cooler heads they recognized that the Interim Code of Conduct was something that was needed and maybe the ideas in there weren't too bad. And so they came up with a new form. Many of the ideas were the same but we now have a code of conduct that has been adopted by the University.

The only thing that's not in its final form is the hearing procedure, the only part that wasn't completed. There was quite a bit of debate on it because there was what they call a hearings officer concept. The Regents felt that the system used in several systems other than ours (one of them, of course, being the University of California and another one in California, too, where they brought in a trained hearings officer; in other words, he was a lawyer), many times there were volunteers that came in, and when there was any real problem where it could result in dismissal of a student or the faculty, instead of being heard by a layman, they were heard by this hearings officer. The faculty, on the other hand, says, "Oh, no, we shouldn't have any hearings officer at all. We should hear our own people (our peers, they called them). And instead of having someone from the outside make our decision, we'll take care of our own problems." And I for one

maintain that that's what we had before, that the faculty had maintained they would take care of their own problems, and so would students, and it hadn't worked out that way. So the compromise that just came out of the recent meeting was that there would be both a hearings officer and a faculty committee and a student committee. And each would make their reports. The hearings officer would be a legal person, probably from a group of volunteer attorneys, and he would determine the facts and the findings, and the committee would make recommendations [as to] the punishment, the guilt and punishment. So there were two different concepts came out of the answers and what I believe is a good compromise. I think it's going to work out. This will be in print so you can pick it up as of the next Regents' meeting.

One of the problems that we had was in deciding who would be the final officer. When I became chairman of the Board of Regents, I made a statement, and my statement went something like this: "I believe that the Regents should delegate authority to any officer or anyone who is in charge of a particular part of the University system. But when you delegate authority, you should also delegate to them the responsibility that goes along with it." And the majority of Regents agree that this is the proper way to approach it. We got to this one particular point, and there was arguments on both sides, and the point was, "Well, do you ever reserve the right to reverse the president, then, on this hearings concept?" And what I mean by that is, if a man is found guilty, then he can, either way, either concept, he can appeal. He comes before the Regents even after the president has found him still guilty. But if the man is found not guilty and the president says that he's not guilty, then there is—under the one concept, that was the end of it. The president says okay, the man's not

guilty, we're not going to do anything about it, then the Regents can't come back in and do anything about it.

The other concept was that the man would come to the top there and he would be found guilty. He could appeal, and if he was found not guilty, then the Regents themselves could come back in and say, "Well, we don't think the president was strong enough on this thing and he still is guilty," which is what we did in the Adamian case. In other words, we didn't feel that—even though the faculty said that the man was guilty (they recommended leniency) and the president said he was guilty (maybe not quite that much leniency)., we, the Regents, said that if he's guilty, he should be punished.

And so the problem and the way I expressed it was that if we got sometimes caught in (and this is really the only— only in the case of a tenured professor that we ever get to this point, and I have nothing to do with students, but—), we could be set up where a tenured professor could be found not guilty and the president could uphold that not guilty concept. And yet the Regents realized—or felt that the man didn't belong as part of the University system. And they would be unable to fire the man or dismiss him. They would have to keep him. The only thing that they could do, then, to come back would be to dismiss the president. Then they would still have the tenured professor. However, at a vote of five to four (and I was one of those who voted the other way), we do have it that the final authority is the president of the University. And there is no appeal for a not guilty verdict. There's still the appeal to the Board of Regents for a guilty verdict of a tenured professor.

I don't know if I've said enough about the Adamian affair, and maybe you can rearrange this, can you? Probably the thing, the item that

happened, the event that happened that got the most publicity, the most attraction and the most reaction in the state, throughout the state, was the so-called "Adamian affair."

To review this a little bit, back in May, early May of 1970, at Governor's Day, the celebration was held about four days after the Kent State shootings, where four students were shot at Kent State by the National Guard. They were patrolling the university at that time. The students all over the United States, ours included, put on demonstrations, but our demonstration was supposed to have occurred on one end of the campus, while the Governor's Day, which consists of awarding medals to those students who were outstanding in ROTC and in some of the drill corps, and so forth, that go along with the military part of our University—. But because of tensions, and so forth, there were a group of students who were willing to go up there and not just demonstrate, but to actually try to disrupt the proceedings. They were led by a man, Paul Adamian, who was an assistant professor of English, University of Nevada, Reno. He received his tenure in April, just one month before. There was a question because he—although we voted him tenure in April, it wasn't to take effect until July. But because we had voted it, we were advised that he would in fact be called a tenured professor. And so he took an active lead and the evidence showed that he was trying to get the students to really disrupt the proceedings that day. They stopped a motorcade that carried the chairman of the Board of Regents, president of the University, the governor of the state of Nevada, and quite a few other dignitaries. And then when they got up on the Mackay Stadium to put on the Governor's Day show, these people came up and marched. These were the protestors. The Kent State protestors came up and marched around the track, and

they were advised that they could do that and that would be a way of demonstrating that they were upset about the Kent State killings. But they weren't satisfied with that and they came in and actually disrupted speeches, the ceremonies, and they jeered at people who were receiving awards, and one particular couple were donating a posthumous award for their son who was in ROTC, graduate of the University of Nevada, and so we felt that something should be done about it. Some sort of disciplinary action should be taken against those who were actually trying to tear down our system of government, and also, they were showing disdain toward our leadership and toward the University of Nevada itself.

And so it just happened that one week later, the Board of Regents met in Elko and the demonstrations were still going on on both campuses and we got the reports from the different campuses. But there was a lot of student sentiment on the other side. The so-called cowboys had come in, and there was going to be quite a battle. So this again pointed out that we should do something about it. And so the Regents then authorized the president of the University of Nevada, Reno to find out who the people were that caused this problem and to present charges against them if they felt there was enough evidence. And I specifically asked that two of the people that he should check out were two of them whose names came up almost every time anybody talked about it, talked about what happened on Governor's Day, and they were Dr. Paul Adamian and Mr. Fred Maher, who was, I believe, a teaching fellow or something like that in the English department. Both of them, however, were treated as though they were tenured professors, and then I mentioned a little bit ago, the evidence against Fred Maher was not enough, so the charges were dropped. But this is not what happened in the Adamian affair.

Well, to make a long story short, there are a lot of legal ways of postponing hearings, and so forth, and you're asked for the thirty days, so you have thirty days to answer the charges. It took about thirty days to get the charges, which I'm not sure whose fault that was. Then he had thirty days to answer the charges. And then after he answered the charges, they named a committee and the committee said, "Okay, we'll hear them," and then they asked if he wanted to be heard, and he had another thirty days, and by that time, he had postponed it until school started.

Shortly after the semester started, they had a—well, the students called a leadership meeting at North Shore of Lake Tahoe up at Squaw Valley. And they invited the Regents. Three of the Regents came to the meeting. They were Dr. Fred Anderson, Procter Hug, and myself. We came there expecting to hear from the students and find out what they were thinking and maybe answer some questions, and instead of that, we found ourselves in a spot where they were asking the Regents for answers, and it was pretty hard to describe exactly what happened. But they had brought a man in from somewhere in the Bay area who was going to make a talk, and they said, "Now, let's not make a talk. Let's have a session where everybody just sits around in a circle and exchanges ideas," and I came into the middle of that.

There were several hundred students, a couple of hundred, anyhow. Imagine, students and professors, and so forth, gathered in a group, and in the center of the group were about six people, one of whom was Chairman Procter Hug, and Ed Pine, Dr. Barmettler, and several students (I can't remember who they all were). Two of them were real—well, the type of student leaders that didn't think before they screamed and they asked questions without waiting for answers and they were

very belligerent. I kept my cool, difficult as it was, and heard what some of the things that they were saying and I recognized that many of the things that they were saying were not based on fact at all. They was just based on the emotions, half truths, and suspicion of what the Regents could do. No one seemed really to know what a Regent was supposed to do.

Well, the three of us broke up into smaller meetings and there were some smaller meetings that didn't have any Regents in them and we sat down and really discussed this. We stayed there the rest of the day. And I think that maybe we accomplished something that day, because students began to recognize what a Regent position really was and how he stood and that he wasn't a paid official. We had questions like, "Why don't you spend, you know, all of your time on the campus, making decisions," and so we explained some of the things that I've done earlier in this tape, that a Regent was in charge of the whole system and we were available, and I'm sure that public relations were somewhat improved, but the Adamian affair was just about the middle of that time.

Paul Adamian proceeded to stay around the campus even though he couldn't teach, and I believe he was trying to make a martyr of himself. And he had people feeling sorry for him, had many students who were really not the real, real liberal ones who just felt that we were unfair to Adamian, not knowing the whole story and he wasn't hearing the whole story. Bill Raggio, who was a candidate for United States Senate at the time, said that we weren't being strong enough in our actions against Adamian, that we were allowing teachers to teach that shouldn't be teaching, and made several of that type of remark, which I really believe lost many, many votes from him among the younger people.

Harvey Dickerson, then attorney general, reversed what his own deputy had done at

the University of Nevada in trying one of the cases. He said there was—the results weren't strong enough. That was the Sattwhite case the year before.

So there was a lot of distrust about politicians at that particular time. And there were many, many efforts, both on the part of students and part of some of the faculty and part of many of the citizens to bring the Regents into the great political fray, I guess you would call it. They tried to get us to make political statements. And there were statements made, like Frankie Sue Del Papa said that the Regents were under pressure and that's why they were making the statements. I would like to point out that this just couldn't be true because three of the Regents who were up for election out of the five did not run. And that was Dr. Juanita White, and Tom Bell, and Al Seeliger. One of the Regents who had two more years left in his office ran for the Assembly. The only two incumbents who did run were Dr. Louis Lombardi and myself, and neither one of us campaigned at all. There was no money spent for any type of campaigning, no cards, no advertisements, no speakers, nothing, and we did this on purpose because we did not want to make the University a political football. We didn't answer any of the charges, and, of course, this added backlash, too, because some of the people felt that the Regents weren't, you know, taking a stand.

There are other reasons for not taking a stand because we wanted to follow our code as set out and to be sure that the trial given to Dr. Adamian was completely fair as possible. So he was tried by a committee of faculty people appointed by the Faculty Senate and the duly elected Faculty Senate president, Dr. Barmettler, and everything that was supposed to have—possibly could have been questioned, we made sure that we leaned over backwards to see that it was

fair, contrary to what the newspapers said, and contrary to what many people believed. Dr. Adamian had legal counsel and he was advised on what to do, and whenever he asked for a postponement, we went along with him. And when the faculty committee came up with the fact that he was guilty and they didn't feel that he should be dismissed, we again followed the code and referred back to them and pointed out why we felt all of the facts hadn't been heard. And we did this very specifically, and this was done by individual Regents. Regents, themselves, sat down and put in many hours going over that hearing, all of the testimony that had been given, and was pointed out in their words, the people who testified, why we felt that the correct weight hadn't been given to testimony.

I feel that probably the one that hurt himself more than anyone else was Dr. Adamian in his own testimony. He said, made one statement where he said, "Are you going over there to demonstrate, or shall we go up there to disrupt Governor's Day?" And if you'll note the inflection, he—in his first part of his statement, he said, "Are you," talking about the students. In the second part of it, "or shall we," meaning that if they're going to go up to disrupt, he would be right with them. And this was in his words and his testimony. There are many, many other same kind of phrases in there that that is why the Regents asked to have it reheard. But, of course, the faculty committee again came back and said that, "Yes, he was guilty, but he was not guilty enough to be dismissed." And Dr. Miller stayed with his same previous statement, that he felt that he was guilty but shouldn't be dismissed.

And then, the next meeting (which was a real interesting one), I sat next to Chairman Hug and they had the meeting in the Jot Travis. This was a December meeting, Jot



Travis Union, and the meeting kept getting warmer and warmer because there was a group of people who were just there to disrupt. That's what they were there for, and they were working with each other, they were telling each other. Finally they disrupted the meeting by clapping and chanting, and at that time, President Miller took over and told them, well, look here. What you're doing is hurting all the chances you did have. You're proving that maybe there was something wrong with what was going on. And so he got them calmed down. And Dr. Adamian was there.

During the meeting one of our Regents, Jim Bilbray, kept making reference to the Regents' hearing, which it really wasn't. It was a deliberation. There was no hearing, and the only reason I can see that he did that was to make himself more popular with the students and the professors because I am sure they recognized that it was not a hearing. And then we went into the executive session and found that the findings were substantially correct. We thought that they had missed some of the things that proved that he was even more guilty, and we said, "Okay, faculty, you're right. He was guilty, but we feel that he doesn't have to be guilty twice to be dismissed." And so he was dismissed as of that day.

Another incident, sidelight that happened as I was sitting at the table with Chairman Hug, we got a note handed to us and the note said, "There's a bomb in the Regents' desk." So they cleared the hall, but there wasn't any there. But that's what happened.

Anyhow, the next meeting things had changed quite a bit because a lot of militant students—. Incidentally, this is real interesting to note, that many of those militant students that were leaders last fall and last winter are no longer students at the University of Nevada. Some of them got into real trouble,

real bad trouble. One of them was arrested for stealing a car, and one of them was arrested for distributing or being a pusher, and there was quite a few of them that just left the University. I'm sure that the actions of the Board of Regents made it so that it wasn't as attractive. It was that type of student, and they've gone elsewhere. That's all on that.

Two years ago we moved into a new athletic association, the [WCAC], I believe it is, and that particular one was a basketball-oriented athletic association. We're talking about intercollegiate athletics. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas and the University of Nevada, Reno are both new members of that association, where football really hasn't been an important part of the intercollegiate athletics, although some of the teams do play football, including the University of Nevada, Reno and the University of Nevada in Las Vegas. When we did that, we had some more leeway than we used to have. We were able to do more things for athletes—that is, not the University itself, but the athletic department could do more for them. There was a Boosters Club organized here on the Reno campus, and there's one similar to it on the Las Vegas campus, and I'm not sure that I know what the name of it was. But they raised a good, substantial amount of money down there (speaking of Las Vegas), and they have a winning basketball team and a pretty good football team, considering that they're new.

Many of our people from up here on the Reno campus moved down there to Las Vegas. They charge a fee in Las Vegas of nine dollars per student per semester for athletics. In Reno, they charge a fee of \$7.50 per student per semester. We got a commitment from the students that even though the money was handled by the student body, that they doled it out, that they would continue to pay seven and a half dollars of their money, or pledge \$7.50

of their money toward the intercollegiate athletic program.

We have twelve different sports. Many of them are minor, but nevertheless there are twelve of them. But there were no intercollegiate sports for women, although we do have a very fine gymnastic team and we have a very fine women's ski team. But there was no way for them to be financed to compete. Now, the two sides of this, the questions were that the athletic department and the Boosters Club would contribute something like \$35,000 a year to the University of Nevada, Reno, said that they should be guaranteed to give that \$7.50 every year and that all the money should be spent for men's athletics. Students, on the other hand, contend that since it was their money (because it was collected from their fees), that they should have a say in how the money was to be spent, how much was to be allocated for each sport, and if they decided that some of it should be allocated to women's athletics, that they should have the right to do it. So this got to be a fairly warm issue.

There were statements from both sides—that is, from the Boosters Club downtown and from the students. Mr. Dick Trachok, the head of the athletic department, athletic director for the University of Nevada, went to many meetings on both sides and did his best to work something out, but it finally got to the Board of Regents without any workable solution. So at our meeting the other day, we heard testimony again. This is the second time we heard it from both sides. Some of it was very heated discussion and we came up with—President Miller came up with a recommendation that seems to be the solution.

The new deal is now that \$7.50, the money is not sent to the student body. It's collected as an athletic fee in lieu of a ticket, which is the same as it was before. They can

go to all the athletic sports, and the \$7.00 of it will be allocated for the regular men's athletic program, intercollegiate athletics, and fifty cents will be allocated toward the women's athletics. I'm not sure if that's going to be the complete answer. It really means a reduction of what the athletic department would have gotten from the University, but only a small reduction because they still have all of the other things that happened. We pay the salaries, we provide the gymnasium and athletic field, and many, many other things, and their money that comes from the Boosters Club should be just as good or maybe even better now that they've figured out how this is going to be worked out.

Another thing that came up this year was the ratification of the ASUN constitution. We did this and the one in Las Vegas. I can't think of the name of it right now, but the student constitution was ratified in Las Vegas. And we have adopted the one at the University of Nevada, Reno as it is, knowing that it would have to be changed on the interim basis. The reason for this is because there are many contests coming in from on both campuses from the students who say, "Well, you're not really the people who should be speaking for us because it's never been recognized by the Board of Regents." So the constitutions were recognized for the first time this year. I'm sure that by 1971 in the fall, we'll recognize the one on the Reno campus as a full-fledged representative constitution for the students.

We have, on both campuses, requests to have organizations for the graduate students, but that hasn't worked out on either campus yet. The graduate students just don't have the interest to organize. That's it. Some more positive action.





---

## EXPERIMENTAL COLLEGE

### *ALAN BURNSIDE, PRESIDENT*

The Experimental College started mostly to offer alternatives to the students other than the ones they could get within the University structure. Dan Teglia started it. I guess it was mostly his proposition to begin with. He found people that were interested in it and we got together a little group and went on a trip around the Coast and the Bay area, looking into the other experimental colleges to find out how they did their organizations. And like I said, the major purpose was to offer alternatives that the University didn't offer the students, and mostly, I guess (politically orientated, we were left wing all the way), to bring a larger left wing voice onto the campus.

Eventually, we hope to bring the Experimental College out into the community, 'cause in most of the bigger ones, they're in the community now and it's gone past just the registered student thing, and it's been a big success for all age groups. So that's what the main purpose was, to get it started here, and once it got a name for itself, maybe we could break away from the University and be independent and include the whole Reno-Sparks area.

Last semester and this, I guess the two most successful courses were the Hatha Yoga class and the Revolution class. They both were the ones with the largest signups and the largest, you know, repeating turnout.

The first semester we offered a seminar in nonviolence from Joan Baez's School for Non-Violence in Palo Alto, and that had a great signup, too, and we had our three-day seminar out at Stead, and that was a great success.

This semester I don't know exactly where the classes stand now. At this point, most of them did get under way that were going for a long time. It's up to each instructor's discretion when they—and how many times they meet, and some classes only met three times, and that was all that was necessary to complete the subject matter. So that's it for the classes, too.

Since we were recognized by the Finance Control Board as an organized group on campus, we were allotted some monies and we did have the opportunity to go before them to ask for money for our projects, but we aren't

looked upon as being very organized or very creditable on campus. Not too many people like us, from what I hear, especially within student politics and ASUN government. And it turned out that just about every time we went before FCB for any funds, it turned out into a big name-calling session and, you know, we always had to either compromise or get nothing at all. So most of our funding came from films—well, not most of it, but a lot of our money came from the films that we showed and Tom Hayden, a speaker we brought. But we did get allotted a certain amount for certain projects that were approved by FCB, by some kind of a structure, in that we can't go beyond, so we're somewhat limited.

The courses, all instructors are doing it for free. They don't want any pay, and out of this budget that we did get from Finance Control Board, we were able to allot twenty-five dollars to each class for materials for the semester, which doesn't sound like much, but in some cases you don't need any money. The classes, of course, cost nothing, and we didn't have to get any materials for hardly any of the classes, except things like breadmaking and weaving; we just had to get what they needed to get started.

When we opened signups for classes, it was open for everybody in the community, including students, community, and the only problem we saw was that people from the community didn't realize that they could participate, free of charge, just as the students. So we hope to, over the summer, if we can get anything together, get a place off campus, some kind of a building where we can set up our projects and then distribute publicity in Reno-Sparks and possibly Lake Tahoe and Carson, and all kinds of information, statements of purpose, and try to bring in all the communities 'cause there is a large community in all four of these towns and

cities that could use something like an experimental college. It would really be beneficial for all four communities.

The major problems that most of us in Experimental College saw were that within the University there weren't any courses, classes or professors that a large group of students could relate to on campus. The courses just seemed like old-line high school racist history. They taught us that the black man had no history, things like that. English classes were—I was an English major and it just seemed totally irrelevant to me; I—you know, I wasn't getting anything I could use in the outside world, but I did take one course once. It was a poetry course that was from Professor Adamian, and it just really blew my mind. It was a terrific course! The whole class, the whole semester was a poem in itself. It just really flowed beautifully. And I didn't know Professor Adamian at the time personally, you know; I just thought he was about the greatest thing that ever happened to me. And not too long after that, the Governor's Day thing happened. I still didn't know Professor Adamian that well.

I was pretty active in Governor's Day activities and he wasn't in the front line at all, and suddenly he came out as a scapegoat for the University, and I couldn't handle that at all. I just didn't believe they could get away with something like that, especially a good professor like Dr. Adamian. And now he's fired so I've just about given up on the school.

The Interim Code was another thing. The codes of conduct were typical for student life. There was nothing to object to within those. It was just the way which the Board of Regents came down and handed them to us and just—you know, there was no order at all. We had nothing to say about the Interim Code. It was just given to us and spoon-fed. And that was just another thing that got us up. I don't know; I forget what else.

Besides the experimental college in the Bay area that we visited, they have practical classes. Just name things offhand—you know, just—auto mechanics, anything to get the people that need this education this practical education.

Besides that, there is a school in Mexico that a group of my friends went down to in Cuernavaca. It's called CIDOC. It's the Center of Intercultural Documentation, and I sent away for their catalog, and the courses were just terrific, things like Alternatives in Education, Deschooling, Deschooling in America, Youth in Cuba, Revolution in South America— all relevant, up-to-date courses, things that you could study to find out what is happening in today's world, rather than what was happening in yesterday's. And a group of my friends went down there and they have come back. I know they'll never go to a school in the United States again as long as there is something like that going someplace else. So we would hope someday to get the qualified people, or the people interested enough to study up on the contemporary things enough so they could teach these courses. Because I know there would be a great, great turnout for courses like Youth in Cuba, the Revolution in Cuba, the Revolution in South America, and the problems with education in the United States. There was a few courses on Summerhill, Summerhill and Beyond. There was just something a lot more relevant than what's being offered at most universities here today. And that's what we hope to do at the Experimental College eventually.

With the student elections, I just didn't, couldn't see how there was any comparison between Dan Klaich and John Lundemo. I've known John Lundemo for—well, since the beginning of the last fall semester, so I guess it's about six or eight months. And during that short period of time, I've got to

know him really well, and he's just bubbling over with good ideas. And even though I knew this, I didn't think he could present it to the student body well enough, and we, the Experimental College, were ready to push Kevin Weatherford for ASUN president, and we thought he'd be a shoo-in. And then Kevin decided to quit school and John was going to run, and it just turned out that John's campaign was just incredibly beautiful. He had so many great ideas, and he went out and just—well, it seemed he was going twenty-four hours a day to the dorms and fraternities—you know, you just couldn't stop him. And I saw Dan Klaich—even though he might be a nice guy, it just didn't seem like he had to work for his election. It just seemed like he got his friends to go out and vote for him regardless of what he said. It got me really mad, but the better man had to lose by a couple hundred of votes.

Then that letter I wrote to *Sagebrush*, I said that it took John a couple of weeks of campaigning to get almost nine hundred votes out, and I think Klaich only went out and campaigned a couple of hundred votes. And in the same letter, what got me angry was the apathy of the long-haired students. It just seems like they're starting to believe their own myth that they're the saviours of our society. And they're just sitting back thinking the rest of them are going to do it. And like I know down in Berkeley, there is a large, large longhair community and they get things done, but there's also the heavy dope freaks that don't do anything. And I come up to the University of Nevada and it just struck me as being a big party school. Everybody comes up here to get party. They want to get their "high," whether it's beer or marijuana. And I have nothing against people doing that, but when they sit back and complain—no matter who they are, they complain about things and want to get things done and then don't

want to work for it—that gets me really angry. And that’s why I just had to write something about the student longhairs because they’re the same way. They just sit around and—you know, wonder what chick they can get in their room tonight and how high they can get and then how much they can complain and not do anything.

There is just incredible apathy on this campus. All the little projects and things we’ve had going have met with virtually no support. This April 24th thing that we’re trying to get going here, I haven’t been working too much with it, but my friends have, and there’s about ten or fifteen names on the list, of people who are willing to take cars down or even to go down. And for a campus of 6,000, I think this is just ridiculous. The apathy on this campus is—you know, just what students started up against. The apathy in the ’50’s generation is what the students started up against in the ’60’s. And now, on this campus, it looks like we’re a throwback to the ’50’s. It’s just nothing. You can’t get anything out of the student body, pro or con.

At the time Governor’s Day was happening, everyone was involved because it was in that moment. Same thing with Kent State and the Cambodian Invasion. It’s happening at that time. It becomes an issue. People get up. They spend a day, two days, three days, maybe even a week, being involved with that issue, and then it becomes old hat to them. And—you know, it becomes, “Oh, that, you know,” “Oh, the Adamian thing,” “I’m sick of the Adamian affair.” People want to forget about it. So then that was last May, and charges were brought against Paul—I don’t know, in the summer sometime, last summer, and it was only last December when his final trial came up, and that time there were ten or fifteen people that cared enough to go to that Board of Regents meeting and get something going. What

happened to those twelve, fifteen hundred people that signed the petition in support of Dr. Adamian? Where were they all? They all knew about this. If they were outraged last May like I was, what makes them keep from getting outraged this December when he’s getting his head chopped off?

I was more depressed than anything at the Board of Regents meeting. I didn’t say anything or do anything. I just stood there with my head hung most of the time while Kevin, Jonathan, and Dan, they did most of the talking. I was just thoroughly disgusted with nonsupport for Dr. Adamian, especially after all he’s done for this campus through his classes.

The United Student Alliance, I guess, started now; I wasn’t around too much then. I had just started getting involved with this campus’s politics around that time. I guess that spun out of the observation by blacks and whites on campus that there was a definite need for unity between blacks and whites. There’s a small minority of blacks on this campus, most of them here on athletic scholarships, I think. And when they tried to railroad Jesse out of school for what he did, I honestly think that if there wasn’t any unity between the blacks and whites, this school would have gotten away with it. I’m not trying to sound like the black students needed the white students, but that looks like the way it might have turned out, because United Student Alliance was an alliance between blacks and whites for the purpose of unity behind Jesse. And if it wasn’t for the crowded rooms at his hearings, I think he would have got pushed right out of school and there wouldn’t have been any news of it or anything, maybe a small article in *Sagebrush*. But I think the people who got together and supported Jesse blew it up way out of proportion and got the publicity it needed, and thus he’s still in school.

The thing that is silly now with tests in most college classes is the fact that they're just hung up on trivia, trying to catch the student. Names, okay, but dates—I don't understand why dates are important as long as you know the chronological order of events through history. So many of my tests, I can tell exactly what to look for when I'm studying. Just look for the things that the professor would most likely want to catch you on, is what it seems like to me. And if you can remember these little things, these little minor details that he might try to throw in the test, there is a good chance you can get a C or B on the test. And that's when I realized that what's the sense of taking these courses if the main thrust of the course takes a sidelight and all this trivia becomes the forefront of the class.

My first two political science courses were just a general sweeping of political science. Supreme Court cases are important, too; but then again, most all he wanted to know about them was *Miranda vs. who and when*. The main thrust behind the whole case kind of took the background again, and the most important part of all Supreme Court cases is what the outcome of them was, and it just seems like that's the problem in all classes I've taken.

We're kind of disenchanted, at least I have been, since I have been going to school, just about any school. It's true that the bookstore kind of rips you off because they have almost a monopoly on things like textbooks and students' needs. And this one at this University was ridiculous. I took a poetry class in a school back on the East Coast and a poetry anthology was required, and now, let me think of the price. I paid \$2.80 for it back East. I still have the book with the sticker in it from the school's bookstore. \$2.80, and I came out here and I was just checking out the whole English department's book list and I saw the

same poetry anthology, and I picked it up and looked at this bookstore's price sticker, and it was \$3.95. There's a \$1.15 difference between the East and West Coast, so I knew that this store is marking things up. I bought a bulb for my flashlight for fifteen cents, and I peeled off the price sticker and there was a ten-cent sticker underneath. So we got pretty mad at that.

And I know everybody wanted to have some kind of an alternative for textbooks, so this semester we got friends of ours who owned a house, and we just took a few rooms of the house that they let us have and we set up some shelves, then put out some fliers telling people that if they don't want to get ripped off by the ASUN Bookstore any more, bring your books here and we will have an exchange system. And so what we did was when the people brought their books in, we had them fill out a piece of paper with their name, the title of the book, and how much they wanted for the book, and then we put it on the shelf in its proper category, and if somebody came in and bought that particular book, we'd see whose name it was, take their money and put it in an envelope with that person's name on it. So this way, the student, if he really just wanted to get rid of his books for a little money, he could do that, or if he wanted to make his money back on his books, he could do that, too, and it worked out really fine.

I think we handled about five hundred books, and I just take an estimate of three dollars for books. So that's \$1,500 for books that we kept away from the bookstore. And I thought it was a great success, and everybody who participated in it thought it was a good idea, too, but I think a lot of people stayed away because they knew Experimental College was running it, and I don't think we're too trusted yet with the main part of the student body. And we're just hoping that

next semester these people who were involved in it this semester will spread the word that it was a good thing and we'll have most of the student body participating in it and they'll save a lot of money.

There was a chance last semester for Women in Society, a course that we're offering, to get offered through the sociology department for one credit, two credits—I don't know, this semester or next. And we were seriously thinking about working on that, but then we were talking about it, Dan Teglia, Jonathan Andrews and the other people on the Experimental College Board, and we were kind of split down the middle, whether or not we wanted to recognize that the University is the next best step after Experimental College.

We originally started out as an alternative to the University in education, and if a successful course in Experimental College gets absorbed into the University, it just seems like we're that one cut below the University, and we don't want to be that. We want to be more of an alternative. Everybody wants, originally, when they become opposed to the University, to work in some way to change the University more towards what they think it should be. Personally, my opinion, I'm not too sure I have any more ambition to try to change the University. I've tried and I don't think it can be changed. I think there's too many rules and regulations and Catch 22's, a lot of those that you can't get past to get the things you want.

So I think the alternatives to the University is what it's all going to be about in the coming years, you know. People are just going to say, "To hell with the University." I'm going to do what I want to do. If people want to do the same thing, good. And I think that will be the most important thing in education now, is free schools.



---

## FACULTY SENATE

### *PROFESSOR EDMUND R. BARMETTLER,*

### *CHAIRMAN*

I am Edmund R. Barmettler, Chairman of the Faculty Senate for 1970-71. My concern is the relationship of the faculty to its Senate and to the general University, to the community at large, and more particularly, to students.

The University of Nevada, as you are well aware, is a growing institution, and one of the things we are concerned with as a faculty is the University's growth and development. We would probably prefer, if we were right honest with ourselves, to keep the University fairly small. I think, as a faculty, we recognize that there is much greater pleasure and a more creative, intimate environment to work in in a small institution than in a large institution such as Ohio State, the University of California, or any of the other big institutions. Of course, there is also the feeling that perhaps we are not quite as good as these institutions, and yet I am not really sure that this is a fact. Because we are small, because we are in Nevada, is not a good reason to believe that we are flat as good. I think we are as good as these larger institutions in many areas. I think we have a strong faculty. We have a dedicated

faculty. This does not, of course, mean that the potentials for improvement don't exist. They do exist, and we see them in our work as a University, and particularly as faculty members. Although faculty members do not speak out in the same fashion that students do, or that administration does, the faculty usually speaks out individually and independently. Sometimes, it does seem that the faculty is not completely in agreement with the idea that the Senate is able to fully represent them, because I think we all recognize that you cannot fully represent all views of any group such as our faculty. But I think down deep also, that the Senate, and more particularly its executive board, recognize that we're in a period of change, and this year has been particularly changeable. For example, the University is faced with very austere budgetary constraints. A new code has been developed and many faculty feel that programs may be abandoned as a result of budgetary and administrative constraints imposed on UNR. The governor did, in fact, give us much less resources than we, as a University, expected to have in order

to carry on the functions that we have carried on for a number of years, and the growth that we've expected to attain. So it's been necessary for us, particularly those in the leadership position, to make some decisions which have been very, very difficult—difficult because of our own ambivalent idea of a small, good university being preferable to a large, mediocre university.

So it's been a question of, how do you change, how do you adjust? First of all, how do you adjust to smaller budgets, that this is an immediate short run problem. However, a more difficult long run problem. is, where are we going as a University, where do we ultimately reach out to give the type of services that we have to give as a faculty, as a university community. There is a lot to be given, and, of course, it does cost money.

As a faculty, we have introduced new dimensions into this whole business of a University. The faculty feels and has made apparent to administration, to students, and to the total faculty and perhaps even to the community, that it wants a voice in the governance, the operations and the establishment of goals of the University. But in a final analysis, someone that is closely involved in the University, such as the faculty, needs to have a strong voice in governance. The faculty has asked the president of the University, the University that's been here nearly a hundred years, and has served this state well, and will continue to serve this state well, to let us help establish new goals, new procedures and organizations. The faculty has therefore asked President Miller to cause a study to take place within the University, a study to determine if there are, in fact, some things that have lost their purpose, some things that perhaps may be redundant, and some things that may need to be changed. Here, we are more in harmony with students

than we are with the general community and perhaps with administration. The faculty is concerned with both the long run and short run views, whereas we often see administration more concerned with short run biennial views.

Over the last twenty-five years since the second world war, the University will have pyramided some things that perhaps have not really been good for us. We have accepted research grants because often they have represented much money, and we have taken these because someone has said we will share with the state the benefits that are to be accrued. Suppose that someone offers us a hundred thousand dollars as long as the state matches a hundred thousand dollars, and then you have a kind of situation wherein you can see yourself building four or five new faculty positions in a department. You rationalize that you are getting involved in a much broader, more sophisticated research, or at least this is what we think is more sophisticated. We believe ourselves to be tied more closely to the national scene or with a regional concept or perhaps even international research assignments. And yet maintenance of this sort of structure becomes after a while so difficult that you have to surrender some of the basic concepts of free inquiry in order to conform to the demands of the funding agency—in other words, to get the funds to maintain the system. This, I believe, becomes a really serious dilemma for many universities. With surrender comes more control, and we literally fail the long term concept wherein is created an environment where learning and teaching and where inquiry can freely take place.

So these are the sort of concerns the faculty has. The faculty needs also to do a couple of other things. It needs to speak out in a much more articulate fashion than it has



in the past. It needs the Senate to do this. It needs to stand up and be counted for ideas and practices such as academic freedom, the freedom to make inquiry and so on, even though that it may be in conflict with the existing vested or highly vested interests. A free society, I don't think, can truly function if it is intimidated and does not hear the voices of its most capable people and if it is not able to incline its ears to new ideas. Perhaps within our system there remains free means for inquiry; I'm not really sure. I am just much afraid that those voices are muted over the clamor of the more glamorous and more flashy sort of things that go on in the University, and human progress, I believe, is really where that muted voice is.

Now for some specific things that have happened in this last year during the time that I have been privileged to be chairman of our Faculty Senate: Certainly the most traumatic and noisy thing that happened was the situation that evolved after Governor's Day, particularly the events leading up to and including the hearing for Dr. Adamian. We do know this— that we were fairly unprepared to deal with that situation. There is no doubt but that the tools we had at our disposal as a faculty or as administrators and as Boards of Regents were not adequate to come to grips and seriously give justice to all constituents within the system. I think because of this absence of means to deal effectively and with equity, a number of things have happened that I believe will ultimately be quite regrettable for the University.

One of them is that some rights of the faculty were abrogated. And when I say rights of the faculty, obviously I'm also talking about Mr. Adamian's rights. For example, we made every effort to conform to the rules and to whatever procedures that were available to us to conduct the hearing on Mr. Adamian.

Mr. Adamian was not allowed a hearing prior to being suspended, and that process used was contrary to the basic rules that were set down in the Code and in the Board of Regents Bylaws in Section 1.5. I'm persuaded that the Board of Regents had made up their minds prior to the time that the documents of the faculty hearing committee had reached them.

I also feel that Mr. Adamian was used as an example more than he was used as a true malcreant independently and responsible for his particular action. I think he is being chosen to suffer for all those that participated in that Adamian affair, or Governor's Day activity. There were professors, there were many students, there were students that had literally signed a petition that they indeed did participate, and if Adamian was to suffer, they, too, should suffer the consequences.

I believe that the faculty committee that heard the case was in an infinitely better position to make the judgment and make the recommendations than were the Board of Regents in selecting some examples out of the hearing process in making their judgments.

As far as the faculty was concerned, we kept meticulously close (I don't know if that's a proper word) to the procedures that were prescribed for the hearing. We did all of those things that we believed were necessary to conduct the case in the proper fashion. And additionally, in fact, I feel very strongly about the idea that faculties are perfectly capable of governing themselves and to make judgments, as are lawyers, as are doctors, as are Army colonels or anybody else, and that we have very little need for a group of lawyers outside the campus to come in and make judgments for us. I don't think that the quality of justice is in any way tied up with the fact that one is trained to be a lawyer. Justice is quite apart from procedure, and I contend that any good man or woman that sits

a panel can make a decision upon the idea of professional justice. What is it that we are doing to a man in making these judgments? We are saying to him that you may no longer ply that trade you decided to dedicate your life to. Even in the Adamian case, as far as I'm concerned, a man that's highly dedicated, should be heard by his peers. I, too, think that Dr. Adamian could have been effective in many other ways and he would have been much less objectionable. Maybe society is willing to suffer the objectionable in order to be heard. I think, then, that one ought also to recognize that in the final analysis, Dr. Adamian has to accept the idea that he knew that there were certain risks involved in the sort of thing that he attempted to accomplish.

Now as for the business that the Senate is normally concerned with. There are two broad categories of work that we're involved with. These are the things that affect faculty members specifically, such as salary, welfare, and how we are going to be treated within this system, and finally, those things that are concerned about the work we do.

To do the work of the Senate, we've established six basic committees in the Senate. These are: the faculty welfare committee, which deals with prerogatives outside of the salary area, things that attract faculty members to the University of Nevada, as well as salary.

Another committee is actually the salary committee, which is concerned about attaining a salary level that is competitive with other western universities. Since I said that we were as good as other faculties in the Western region, we also think we are worth being paid as much as faculty members in the Western region.

We have a committee that is concerned about the Library, the quality of its holdings

and the services that are provided within our library system.

Fourthly, we are concerned again with a committee that deals with the University code, the rules of governance of the University and its faculty.

Finally, there is a committee that deals with organization; we call it information and documentation. This is a committee that dedicates its efforts to publishing such things as a faculty handbook which is coming out for the first time from the faculty this year. Perhaps we will even have enough money to publish it, along with the faculty advisor's handbook. These are two things that we badly need in the University, and I think the faculty ought to be the basic unit of putting these together.

There are other important faculty concerns, such as what do we teach, what's the nature of teaching and learning environment. These questions are handled by what we call our academic standards committee.

For the first time in the eleven or twelve years that the Faculty Council or the Faculty Senate has existed, we have established a program of work on things that we have wanted to accomplish over this work year (1970-71). "It's innovative." It was said to me, "It cannot be done." Some of us didn't hear these comments, so we decided to go ahead as an executive board and publish a little book called "The UNR Faculty: It's Goals and Objectives." We set down in this publication what it was we expected the faculty to accomplish.

We did one other thing; we found six good chairmen, one for each of the six committees. We didn't say to them, "Here is a group of people you will work with," but we said to them, "Look, these are the responsibilities of the committee, these are the things that we need to have done, and we are going to tell you

when we want to have answers, so you better tell us now who it is around the University that can work with you to then come and bring to us the best possible thinking from the members of the faculty.” We told them what we wanted done and we gave them time periods in which to accomplish. They were then asked to select people to work with. It has been one of the most astute things I think we as an executive board have done.

None of the committees have yet disappointed us, and we’re so close to the end of the year that I doubt very much that they will. Some of them are struggling to come to grips with some very significant problems, and, of course, this was to be expected.

The academic standards committee is probably the largest of the six committees. I can’t say it’s more responsible than the code committee, because the code committee has a different kind of responsibility. Academic standards is the one that is exposed most closely to the students and to the teaching arrangement than any others. By the way, it’s the committee made up basically of people that are in the academic field because it’s the committee that we assign most responsibility in areas that concern the undergraduate council, which is a part of the Senate.

We ask them to do such things as establish the purposes of this University. We asked them to think about the qualifications necessary to be granted a degree at this University. Why should it be that we require 120 credits? Why should engineers and agricultural economists and artists and business majors all require 120 to 130 credits? If everything is of this nature, then we ought to be able to do the role of educating much more efficiently, but you and I both know that this is ridiculous. It simply doesn’t seem like rational men would make judgments in this fashion, so we are asking them to look at it. Additionally, we are saying

to them, “What is relevant instruction?” We’re teaching a lot of stuff at this University, and perhaps there are some courses or programs we can do without. We think that we ought to do well in some areas and maybe let some other institution do some other things.

The committee was then charged to look at the whole concept of relevance, and some of the questions that we’ve asked are how and to what degree ought the University become involved in issues served us by various sectors within our society, considering also that some of these may be in conflict with existing, well established concepts and programs of the University. We are challenged constantly within the system.

We are concerned, too, with questions concerning our curriculum. Are their curricular items generally relevant and applicable to all students entering the University of Nevada? Is a core concept or a general college concept perhaps a more useful approach?

If there is one thing that I think a faculty ought to be more concerned with, it is, “How do you improve instruction?” How do you communicate with young people, or old people, or whomever comes to you to learn? How do you make it possible for this individual to walk away from that university and say, “Here, now, I have gotten some new insight, some new depth and understanding of what the University is, what the world is, who I am, how I fit within this whole system.” So improvement of instruction indeed appears important to me.

We are also concerned about student service activities, about academic standards, student orientation, admission, registration and student exchange programs.

Another item is the academic calendar. We have known for a long time that the existing semester system isn’t particularly

desirable on the part of many students and faculty. There appears to be less efficient use of time by having a big Christmas lapse and then coming back for two weeks and then picking up the final examinations. Some of my colleagues, when I have spoken to them about this, have said, "Oh, but we do a great many things in that two weeks." Well, I've observed too much and too long to be persuaded that this is particularly true. I think everything seems to slow down after Christmas as far as instruction is concerned.

So we proposed a calendar that students the year before had proposed, a 4-1-4 calendar. In the wisdom of the faculty, we chose to innovate and say a 4-4-1 would be more workable, but the faculty did indeed fool us. It was the only issue, the only Class A action so far that has failed to pass faculty approval. It failed 200-215, so that took a big vote on the part of the faculty of some six hundred faculty members that were here.

A document that has been fondly or unfondly known as the Interim Code was imposed upon us on the eleventh of June, 1970, by the Board of Regents. This document was submitted to the Board of Regents by the then chairman of the Board of Regents, Procter Hug, Jr. It was constructed purely from a legal point of view. It was really stimulated from the Governor's Day action and about the activities that had been taking place on universities throughout the United States.

As far as the faculty is concerned, even though they were given the privilege or the prerogative of writing or rewriting it in such a fashion that it would be more acceptable to the faculty, I still believe the Interim Code was a panic document. We have yet to get a document accepted that involved much of the faculty input.

We were offered an opportunity to submit a counterproposal for the December

1970 meeting. We worked all summer and all fall to get a document established, and it was a document that, in my estimation, was a masterful job of legal, operational, organizational, and procedural processes. It was a good document.

In the meantime, one of the Board of Regents introduced a document that was adopted by the California State College System. It was imposed upon the California State College System. This is now known as the Bell Document or the Bell Code.

The Bell Code does several things that are highly objectionable to the faculty. First, it imposes on the faculty the concept of a hearing officer, an all powerful hearing officer, which literally excludes faculty self-government.. This is a serious shortcoming of that document. It also does one other thing which is objectionable. It places the decision making authority in the Board of Regents, rather than into the operational decision authority of the president. This, too, is objectionable. As far as the faculty was concerned, it needed to be able to modify the hearing officer concept to some manageable, acceptable, adaptable level, and to get the power of operations and decision-making back into those that were hired to do the job, namely the president of the University.

Recently, in the last month or month and a half, the Board of Regents asked Gene Barbagelata, the attorney in the office of the chancellor, who is a member of the state attorney general's office, to write a document in consort with that presented by the Board of Regents, namely, the Bell Document, to include some of the things that are of faculty concern. We saw this document, and through the Coordinating Council, those of us that are in the leadership position on the campuses, it was unacceptable to us and to the faculty.

I may need to go back a moment and say that all documents have failed to get action basically because of faculty concern, of faculty objection, and the loud voice that was raised by the faculty and the faculty leadership, as well as, I think, the administrative officers within the system, because they, too, have not been mute. They have spoken up, which I think is their responsibility, when things are done not in a logical and constructive sense, but rather because of fear.

We asked Mr. Barbagelata to write for us a document that encompasses many of the concepts that the faculty holds. The Bell Document was then presented to us in one of the Coordinating Council meetings and it was rejected by the Coordinating Council, and a proposal to rewrite this second document for the faculty was made. This, then, also went before the Coordinating Council, and although it includes the hearing officer, the powers of the hearing officer are so defined that the committee makes the decision as to what the recommendation will be to the president, and the president will make those decisions, and only in the event that an individual is terminated or in the event the individual is expelled from the University does this individual have then the privilege of appealing to the Board of Regents. I think this is the way it ought to be.

I believe if the Board of Regents think so strongly in a contrary fashion to that of the decision the president makes, they, of course, they have the serious problem of deciding whether they want to keep the president. They ought to hear the appeal upon the merit of the appeal, not upon the case.

The Interim Code, then, becomes an all important document in the future, and I think we will hear a lot more about this document.



---

## INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

### *DICK TRACHOK, DIRECTOR*

This is Dick Trachok, the Athletic Director here at the University. I assumed my present position on July 1, 1970. Prior to that time, Jake Lawlor was the Athletic Director. He is still on the staff at the University, handling our golf team and teaching in the physical education department. He is close to retirement and that is one of the reasons why there was a change as far as the Athletic Director is concerned. Within a year or so, he will probably retire from the University, having spent some thirty years here.

To give a breakdown on what we've been doing or what the athletic department's office has been doing, as I mentioned, I took over on July 1. The first big item we had was what we hope will be our annual governor's fund-raising dinner. Last July 10 was the second one we held. This was a program initiated under past Governor Laxalt. We held it for two years; each of the two years we grossed \$50,000. That came about by having five hundred people attend and the tickets to the affair were sold for a hundred dollars. The committee last year that we had working on it was chaired

by Clark Guild, Jr. and Bob Cashell. We are now under way making plans for the 1971 fund-raising dinner. And I'll come back to that very shortly here. We start after July 1, of course, in getting the fund-raising dinner out of the way.

The other functions that were involved as far as off campus are concerned—we have a kickoff barbecue, holding that for the last eleven years. For our program, this raises an additional, roughly \$5,000 that got us. There was a kickoff for the football season, and we had a successful season as far as the wins and losses were concerned. We won six games, lost three and tied one, but the more important thing was the way the team was handled and had the ball bounced properly; the record could have been 8-1-1 very easily.

Then, of course, our next biggest sport (everybody rates football and basketball on the par) is basketball. We finished our second year in the West Coast Athletic Conference. Prior to that, which was just two years ago, we were a member of the Far Western Conference, and as I mentioned,



this was our second year in the WCAC, and unfortunately, we didn't do well as far as the wins and losses were concerned. We felt that that had to be somewhat expected, in that we were thrown into the league, at our request. It put us at a disadvantage in one sense as far as the recruiting was concerned. In the Far Western Conference, no scholarships were allowed, and the WCAC, all of the basketball people there offer the full scholarships. So it takes a few years to catch up, let the students know that you have a program, and that you are looking for quality student athletes. As a result, we are hoping that come '71-'72, the basketball program will start rolling a little better than it is.

The other sports that we have (and we run twelve of them) had average years. There would be no sense in going into the wins and losses of all of them, but as far as they were concerned, it was roughly a normal year.

A lot of attention was given, a lot of publicity, as far as the Student Finance Control Board was concerned. They would like to control the funds that they spend for student body cards, and the amount that go into athletics. In discussions with them, it is pointed out that the \$7.50 that the Athletic Department is supposed to get is in lieu of each of the students buying a separate ticket to go to each of the contests. We have roughly sixty home contests. The students, by paying the \$7.50, are admitted free to all of them. Originally the fees were set up to save the students money, give them a cut-rate card, and this is the way it is now. It's not a matter of who should be controlling what; the feeling from this office is the students want a quality program, and we're going to try to give them a quality program.

The resolving of this particular problem will rest in the hands of the Board of Regents who will be meeting here in the month of

April. At that time, information will be given to them from all the parties concerned, and then they will decide how these funds are to be allocated.

One thing that we weren't pleased with was our attendance as far as our basketball is concerned. In football, attendance rose over the past several years, but part of that is always based on, predicated on the type of team that you have. college attendance at football and basketball throughout the country has gone up each year for roughly the past fifteen years. We feel we will be in that pattern before too long.



---

## SAGEBRUSH

### SHEILA CAUDLE, EDITOR

I am Sheila Caudle, editor of *Sagebrush*. I ran for editor, I suppose, because there was no one else available last year to run. I'm actually part of the old guard of the *Sagebrush*. I remember in 1969 there was Tom Wixon, Mike Cuno, myself, and Mike Graham. Then Tom Wixon became editor, graduated; Mike Cuno, Mike Graham, and myself were the ones left. Then I became editor, and there was Mike Graham and I. Now Mike Graham will be editor, and that's the end of the old guard. I guess the priorities were all set up for us to run, were just set out so we would naturally follow each other. I don't know what Mike's going to do for a staff next year.

I'm not sure what I hoped to accomplish with the *Sagebrush*. It's kind of a position where before you get it, you sit down and say, "I'm going to do all of these things: I'm going to stimulate the campus into becoming very active; I'm going to put cartoons in and I'm going to liven the paper up," and you get in and it becomes a matter of a job that requires forty, fifty hours of your week. And your school grades suffer, and you find out that

your—what you're mainly interested in doing is getting the damn thing out. That's what I was interested in all year, is on Sunday and Wednesday night we have our deadlines, and that's it, you know? You've got all the big ideas in the world, you were just interested in the paper will come out on Tuesdays and Fridays. That's what you do. That's your whole—your whole emphasis on the paper.

There have been some things we've done this year. The papers look more like a magazine, which I was very interested in doing. We introduced a great deal of white space. You can see by that copy on the wall that it one time was all white space. Made it look more like a magazine. I wanted a lot of features for this year about the people on campus, but we couldn't find anybody who was willing to write about people, and, of course, you have a great staffing problem, so that really hinders you. We found it recently that "spring blahs" have hit the *Sagebrush*, so you find that your staff is—they go to Las Vegas for a week. They tell you five minutes before they leave. So you either do the story

yourself or it doesn't get done. It's just that simple.

Another thing we've been hurt by this year is the lack of advertising. The national recession really hurts a campus paper, even though we get \$25,000 a year for the students. And people don't realize that. They think that we should be able to just come out, you know, twelve pages at a time. You can't do that when you don't have the money.

I think we've helped to stimulate more art probably in the cartoon sense because we've had two cartoonists, Kelsie Harder and Norm Durkee. I think it's helped the paper. We haven't run very many editorials this year, which I guess grows out of the—what I feel to be a deep apathetic condition on this campus, although I feel that it goes a lot deeper—very little student activism. I remember last year at this time in May all of the things happening, all the time, excitement. Now there is nothing. It seems to have died, and I'm not sure that it is particularly true on the rest of the campuses, the papers I receive. I'm really concerned about the really lack of spirit that this school has. It's not associated with football teams and this kind of thing—just a lack of awareness of what's coming down here, particularly with the Adamian decision. I think that the University really set back their—the status quo, even lost on that, because the faculty decision was even put down. There's no meaning to whatever was done, and obviously one group of people would decide the fate of a professor. Now we have the same situation with another faculty professor who has been, of course, recommended all the way up and down the line. And it looks like he's going to be denied his promotion for the third time in May, and he'll probably leave, and I suspect that many more of our faculty members will leave—good ones. You can't you can't guarantee academic freedom at this school. I

doubt that we're doing—we had a beginning of good faculty. I'm afraid that we're really going to lose it now. These instances—this may seem kind of negative view of the Interim Code. I see no reason for an Interim Code at all. We did take a stand on it and lost. Lost Adamian. It was a really negative year, I guess.

The profanity policy that was adopted by the Regents—we were kind of caught in a bind this year. The Regents in May told us that we would have a profanity policy and preferably we would not run to profanity. Although they called it obscenity, they obviously didn't know what they meant. So we functioned all this year without one. And I think it was February or so, or January or something like that, as the Regents were meeting to decide whether or not we would have a profanity policy, I received two letters to the editor which were profane, and they were probably obscene as well, although not in that strict definition of it. It was unfortunate in that—well, the Regents were asking us not to run obscenity; we, in effect, slapped them in the face by saying we will do whatever we damn well please, which didn't go over at all. Publications Board, of which all editors are a member, have a vote, decided that it would probably be better if the *Sagebrush* did have a profanity policy, since the Regents obviously wanted one. So I wrote the profanity policy which said we will run the first letter of the profane or vulgar term and it will be followed by dashes according to the number of letters.

Then I ran into a great deal of difficulty. I intended to go by this little rule. I thought, "Well, it says so right in the compromise." But the problems involved in computerized type out at the shop, the computer will read the line if there are dashes. It might put five dashes and then one on the next line. And, of course, there are some words, like, for example, "bullshit," where you say, "Shall

I put the ‘B’ and then all the dashes, or the ‘bull’ and all the dashes, or ‘bull-dash,” you know? And I decided that, well, I’m not sure that bullshit is really profane. I’m really not sure that it’s vulgar. So I ran it and nothing happened, and since then I’ve sneaked in “bullshit” a couple of times and no one has said anything. I can’t understand the big furor over the term, originally. When these terms did appear in letters to the editor, obscene or profane or whatever term hasn’t run in the news columns, except once, and it was in reference to what the kids were yelling at the guard at Kent State, which— I thought it was relevant. So you see one time it’s run in the news columns, but I told the Regents at the Regents’ meeting that I wouldn’t play God on letters to the editor, and I think their position was, “If you won’t play God, we will,” so we compromised with the profanity policy. It’s kind of funny, now that I think about it.

The drinking policy, I think, was a step forward, especially since it was put in for an interim period, and now they’ve decided to make it permanent. It’s more of a livable concept on campus instead of, “everyone drinks there.” We have a joke around here now. We tell President Miller that, “You bring the wine, and we’ll cluster in my office, all the twenty-one-year-olds.” I’m sure that most people are still drinking in their rooms anyway, whether they are twenty-one or over. It’s a more realistic view of the situation. I’m glad the Regents have decided to approve that document.

*Sagebrush* normally doesn’t take a stand on the election personnel, because we feel since we have a monopoly on the news we have no right to endorse any one candidate. Probably the one we would endorse, our endorsement would probably hurt more than it would help them. And sometimes we lose in the case of the issue and amendments. I

thought they were—I think there were four or five amendments that I thought were very good and worthwhile, and apparently nobody cared, or they disagreed with us, but it was defeated.

I think at times the *Sagebrush* has been used. I’m referring in particular to the case of Peggy Bowen vs. the Election Board. We were the first ones that she came to with her story, knowing that this would reach practically all of the campus and many off campus. Instead of doing it quietly, some people choose to use the media, and it’s a legitimate news story, and the editor finds herself or himself in a very awkward position, because—what can you do? You know you’re being used, but it’s a good story. So you probably run it and you think later, “What would have happened if I hadn’t’ve run it?” We wouldn’t’ve had this big la-di-da over the whole thing. We’ve been used before, and I think it’s one thing an editor really has to watch out for, is who’s using you and why are they using you and is it a legitimate use of you.

Athletics—this really has been a losing year. Yeah, athletics, lost one again, by God. We thought we had a good case with athletics. Again, the Regents totally ignored what the students wanted to do, decided to give the students no responsibility whatsoever when that responsibility had been shown in the past, and decided to take it away. Although I think I said it in an editorial that they didn’t make the foolish mistake of raising the fees, I felt that it would be very hard for them to justify raising athletic fees for a very questionable department in view of that the University had been asked to cut five percent and we lost \$20 million in the budget.

We have put some new features in the paper. Referring to ecology for one, we received the best community service plaque from Nevada State Press Association for

coverage of ecology which we were quite surprised to get. We were putting in the applications for these various contests and we got to community service, and we said we have no chance at all to win this. So I took an ecology issue published last year plus some of the things that Tod Bedrosian had done for the *Sagebrush* this year and I just stapled them together and kind of threw them in the envelope, knowing that, well, at least we were entered. I knew we weren't going to win anything, so it was a great surprise to win that.

We also came out with a special supplement, "The University: Where It Is," and I was a little disappointed in this, mainly because we couldn't go twelve pages on it. We only came out with eight, and that was funded by the Honors Board. Again, advertising hurt us. We didn't have the money to come up with four extra pages, no advertising. We just couldn't afford it. I was surprised at the number of essays we got back, although I think it could have been better. Here was an open forum for anyone on the campus to get off their chest what they didn't like or liked about the University, and I think we only had twelve essays, I think five of which were not from the University class, and that was an assignment of the University class, "You will write an essay for the *Sagebrush*." So only five of the others really wrote their essays. And after it came out, I heard a lot of people talking about that they liked it, but again I think, "There were you when you had the chance to write?"

I think that about does it.

---

## STUDENT JUDICIAL COUNCIL

### *JANICE MILLER, CHIEF JUSTICE*

I am Janice Miller. I am Chief Justice of the Judicial Council this year. I might start out by saying why I was interested in getting on the Council.

I think the Judicial Council plays one of the most important roles in student government. It handles student discipline cases. I think it is very important that when students are charged with violations, or they have problems and they are brought before the Council that they do have a court of their peers hearing their case. I think that students are much more able to understand another student's problem, the circumstances surrounding it, and why he perhaps got into the trouble he did. They are much more fair judges than people outside the student realm, such as the administration.

I see my role as Chief Justice, really, as no different from the rest of the justices, except that I handle the paper work and help set up the times for the meetings and things of this nature. I work somewhat with Executive Council on problems, but the Council as a whole works together. As long as I've been in,

which has been two years, we've been a very close council, very good friends, and almost every time we have agreed unanimously in our decisions, which I think is very important. We've argued an awful lot, we've gone into twelve-hour meetings, arguing, but we've all come out with a greater knowledge of the problem, a lot of times a greater knowledge of ourselves through it. We've all managed to agree, or come down to some sort of an agreement, I think, in almost all cases—and I would say all cases (maybe this is biased), but we've been very fair to each and every case that we have heard.

I think a lot of times we've been called upon to answer constitutional questions in which there was no solution in the constitution, and we were called upon to come up with the solution, which is very difficult to do. We were put on the spot many times. But this, too, is a learning process. The overall job of the Council has been a learning process for all of us, involving both students and their discipline problems and also the constitutional interpretations.

Looking back over the past two years at some of the improvements, I would say the biggest improvement in the Council was the efficiency with which it's run, and this isn't due to myself. It is due to the difference in the administration from when I first came in. The first year I was in, things were very inefficient. They were trying to work under a setup with a Referrals Board, which didn't work out. At least, I don't feel it worked out because there was no feedback to any other areas of student government to know whether it was working efficiently, and consequently it didn't. No one understood the problems until they hit us right in the face.

We do have a new Dean of Men now who has been handling the charges, preparing the cases for us, and doing the investigation. This has been a great factor in the efficiency. The last Dean of Men (meaning no disrespect to him) was very lax in this, and consequently a lot of the cases got pretty fouled up.

I think another part of this efficiency is the fact the residence halls now have Judicial Councils which work with smaller cases that occur in the residence halls, such as drinking violations or violation of quiet hours, things of this nature. They handle anything that can invoke a disciplinary action up to, say, warning or censure. Anything involving suspension or expulsion would automatically come to us under the present system.

I think another thing that has been very obvious is, as of last year and this year both, the Council has handled more cases than it ever did in the past. More and more cases are being referred to us, more people are filing complaints and asking us to hear them, and I think that this is a sign that the Council has gained greater respect, because they have handled things very capably.

We could go on to what I see as major events. I would have to start last year about

April. There were two cases that came up, both of which invoked the Interim Code. The first case was the Sattwhite case in which a black student was accused of threatening a number of people and beating up another person. This was made very public in the newspaper. The case went to Referrals Board, and one of the attorney general's representatives was sent there for some reason (we still don't know why, except perhaps because of the publicity), and he got the board to refer the case to the Board of Regents. It got to the Board of Regents and went completely out of hand. They naturally wanted only to be involved as far as an appeal process and nothing else. So the case finally came back to the Council.

I think this is actually the most memorable case we had, in that we started out holding the hearing in the Ingersoll Room, which doesn't seat that many people. There were TV cameras in there, the whole works. We ended up holding it in the Travis Lounge with about five hundred people as an audience, and consequently it turned into a circus. I felt very sorry for the witnesses because they were laughed down a lot of times, and this was due mainly because most of the people who were in there were supporting Mr. Sattwhite.

I do feel that Mr. Sattwhite got a raw deal. He was discriminated against because he was black. The charges brought against him stem back two years, charges that had never been acted upon and all of a sudden were compiled by the attorney general's office and thrown on us, and we were supposed to decide what to do with him. There was a great division here because the students were saying he shouldn't be thrown out. All the community knew was what they read in the newspaper, and they felt that he should be suspended, as did the administration. I believe they wanted to get rid of a troublemaker.



As it turned out, we did put him on probation, and it's quite interesting as to the reaction we received. This naturally hit the newspapers; the Regents were very upset with us. Different members of the alumni committee called both Mike Koizumi, who was Chief Justice at the time, and myself, asking us what in the hell we thought we were doing. Didn't we know he was a troublemaker and shouldn't we have thrown him out? It was really interesting to see how people could judge a person without hearing a case and judge only on what the press had said and the hearsay things they picked up. But then, again, I think a university and the students are always going to have this problem of being prejudged by the press and community.

The next case we had after this was the Governor's Day case. It was my first case as Chief Justice. Needless to say, I was scared to death because we had an audience of a couple of hundred people, again, naturally all supporting the people who were charged. This case went off very badly, too. The Dean of Students failed to bring me the evidence and the testimony against them, and there was nothing to convict them of because there was nothing to back up the charges. As I adjourned the meeting, in walks the Dean of Men, hands me all the witnesses' statements and other material. I refused to reopen the case. I couldn't see how I could reopen it, seeing as I had already adjourned and most people had left.

Well, I again got phone calls from irate alumni members asking what I thought I was doing. I didn't feel that I could tell them that the reason we had to dismiss all the cases was because the Dean of Men had failed in his job. I'm saying this now, and perhaps I shouldn't, but that's exactly what happened. It was no fault of President Miller's, since he was told to have these kids charged and he gave the

responsibility to the Dean of Men. I feel it was strictly the Dean of Men's fault.

As it turned out, with all these errors that occurred during the Sattwhite case and the Governor's Day cases (it was in June of that year), the Interim Code was put on us by the Regents. This all stemmed from the community uproar from what they read in the paper and their calling the Regents up just as Mike Koizumi and I had gotten called. A lot of times you can't print all the facts, such as the case with the Dean of Men at that time. There are times when you have to protect people, but it makes the students look bad, which is unfortunate.

Anyway, the Interim Code went into effect. This actually didn't limit the Judicial Council's responsibilities. It did take out the Referrals Board, and I don't feel that was any great loss. We got a new Dean of Men in, and things have been working very smoothly under the Interim Code. But what's to come is another story.

The first proposal that has been turned in to the Regents for a code of conduct and procedures was turned in by Tom Bell. His proposal limits Judicial Council greatly, if not actually eliminating it. He feels that there should be lawyers hearing these cases, and that administrators should be hearing the cases and that the students shouldn't handle them. I violently disagree with him. I think he, too, like the rest of the community, is a victim of reading the newspaper and not checking into facts. I don't feel that bringing someone in from the outside as a hearing officer to hear cases that may be blown out of proportion, like the Sattwhite case, would really be the solution. You're bringing someone in who knows nothing about the campus, knows nothing about the temperament of it, or the students or their problems, or what even led up to this, except what he had read in the newspapers.



Other proposals have been sent in to them, and students and faculty have been working together very diligently, taking procedures to the Regents, and each time being rejected. I think one of the most difficult things I faced was facing the Regents and trying to explain to them and make them understand where the students stand and that they can be trusted. I know it's not just a problem on our campus; it's a nationwide thing right now. Students aren't trusted because of all the riots and the incidents that have broken out all over. Nevada is naturally trying to crack down to keep this from happening, but I think in the meantime they are being very, very unfair in not even giving the students a chance, in expecting cases like the Sattwhite case and the Governor's Day case to be an everyday thing. What they don't realize is that these were two single events and that we handle as many as fifty other cases a year that are very minor. I think they are discriminating against all students and against their right to have a fair hearing by imposing these strict rules on them, and by trying to completely eliminate students from the disciplinary process. Oh, they have thrown out a few token things so far, like letting students sit in on a couple of these hearing boards, but that's not the point. I think that student discipline is basically the responsibility of students and that they can handle themselves and judge themselves much more adequately than outside people, or perhaps sometimes even administration people.

I think one of the biggest problems leading up to this Interim Code, as I've mentioned many times, and the other problems we've had as far as not being trusted, is the press. We've gotten some very unfair coverage in the press. They get their stories all fouled up and fail to make retractions a lot of times. They've gotten the community irate, and I can't blame

the community for getting upset because the only contact they have with the University is what they read in the newspapers. That's unfortunate because they fail to find out what's really going on, what has happened and what it stemmed from and the circumstances. Consequently, the Regents are influenced by the community, and it all falls on the students, and pretty unjustly most of the time.

This year, our biggest decisions have really involved constitutional questions. There have been (I don't know if you call it a fad, or what you'd call it) many people who have challenged the qualifications for ASUN offices this year. We have been asked for constitutional interpretations to see if they can run for office and have interpreted that they are not qualified. So people in student government have sought to change the rules for certain individuals. This happened in the Lundemo case. They managed to get a special election and actually amend the constitution on the same day as the primary elections.

In the Art Schindler case, he didn't file for election. He was having the same problems as Johnny Lundemo, in that the constitution states that one must be a member of the ASUN the two semesters prior to elections, and we interpreted this to mean that the person would have to be here in the spring and the fall semester in order to run in the following spring election. Other people, of course, disagreed with this, so they changed the constitution very neatly, keeping the balloting booths open for two days so that they could get their percentage of votes and have it passed.

Mr. Lundemo ran and consequently lost. Mr. Schindler couldn't run since he hadn't filed in the first place. There are some questions as to whether he tried to file or not, and we didn't feel he tried very hard. Since the qualifications were in question at the time,

he more or less let it go and then thought he could come in and say that he had tried to file and that someone told him he couldn't. We never did figure out whether he was telling the truth or not. We figured since he hadn't filed, he couldn't run.

After the election, we got the next case which involved eight points, contesting the whole ASUN election. Miss Bowen brought this case to us and asked that the election be invalidated and that a new election be run. She was a supporter of John Lundemo, and how much this had to do with it, who can say. Anyway, that was not an issue in the case or the decision. She said that she challenged the Election Board and the counting of the ballots. Also, the ballot boxes had been open two days at NTI for voting because they are on a much different schedule than we are. It was allowed for the two days out there in order to be more fair to the students and give them a chance to vote. Unfortunately, it wasn't open two days here, so we did have to rule that unconstitutional. We can only leave the ballot—or, the polls open one day as it states in the constitution.

This and a number of other things were brought up in the case, but it raises a lot of questions. She brought the case in, saying that she was representing the ASUN. And the question is raised: does one person have the right to challenge the elections that supposedly reflected the rule of the majority, or the majority opinion, when she had no proof that the majority was even backing her? It was Miss Bowen against the whole election procedure. There were no petitions or anything else signed by other students in the University. And like I said before, there was no evidence that she was even supported by the majority. So we didn't feel that one could overturn elections on this basis. Whether or not we are right, I guess that all we have to go

on is: does the majority rule and are they the ones bringing the charges? We didn't feel that they were. It was one person.

Another point in this case which was of considerable concern was the fact that Miss Bowen was not actually doing all this herself. She was more or less assisted, or perhaps even prodded on to do it by a student from another campus who wasn't even enrolled here at the time. He is a very bright person. He's, from what I understand, a major in constitutional law and he's done this sort of thing on other campuses. I resented it, and I think the Council did, too, from the fact that he is not a student. He just came down here and all of a sudden stirred up trouble. At least, this is the way it looked to us. But then again, this we didn't let have any bearing on the case. This was something that was never brought up or never mentioned, naturally. I felt that the case was ruled on very adequately, strictly from what was presented in evidence, the evidence that was presented by both sides, and we ruled on that evidence alone.

We decided that the elections should not be overthrown. There was not enough cause to do it. There were irregularities, yes. But most of them were done in good faith and in an attempt to make the elections more fair and to reach more students and to do what was best at the time. We didn't feel this was grounds for calling off an election.

But since this case has been ruled on, Miss Bowen has now filed charges of perjury against the two people who brought the case for the defendant. What's going to happen with this, we don't know. I don't think she has any basis for this, but that remains to be seen, since the case hasn't been settled yet. I hate to see this happen, though, because I don't feel that we, as a Council, can afford to get involved in what is perjury and what isn't.

In every Council hearing, when you have one side against another side, there is always conflicting testimony. We have no subpoena power, or an oath that's taken before testimony is given. Therefore, I don't feel that charges of perjury have any place in this kind of hearing. In a court of law, yes, but this is an entirely different situation. We, as a Council, are not a court of law. We are a hearing body, a fact-finding body, and we decide on what we hear. It's up to us to weed out what is true and what is not. I'm sure it's not always easy, but this is the position we're put in. As for perjury, this has never come up before, and the outcome should be interesting.

We found ourselves, as I mentioned before, in the position of solving problems for a very "lacking" constitution. Our constitution is deficient in having means for solving problems that come up. We've been called upon to rectify this many times, as far as having inadequate solutions for problems. We will be working on a revision of the constitution. I will be chairing this committee, and hopefully we can get a constitution that is much more workable and perhaps make the work of the Judicial Council a little easier as far as interpreting instead of being problem solvers besides.

Another constitutional case we had this year involved the Nye Hall constitution. This was, I wouldn't say, a major case for us. It was for Nye Hall, since they were caught between two constitutions and no officers. I don't believe that has been solved yet. They had a constitutional election to try to get a new constitution for then, and this was defeated. We presume they are going under the old constitution, but they have no officers under that, and then there is also a large faction over there that doesn't want a constitution or government in Nye Hall at all. How they solve this problem will be interesting, also.

Finally, all we could do is give the Executive Council—that was intact—the right to do what they saw fit. I was getting phone calls day and night, asking whether they could do this and whether they could do that. I assume that they are solving this problem themselves and will come back when they finally come up with a solution.

There was another request for a hearing this year on the question of the equality of the Finance Control Board and Activities Board. They finally decided that they would try to work this out themselves. I would suggest that such a question should be worked out this way in the future, too. When you bring something like this to the Council, you're asking them to make a rigid ruling on what boards can and can't do. I think this is wrong. If boards can work out their problems together and do it in such a manner that it's still constitutional, the solution is much more acceptable. I think it's very important to keep a constitution flexible and not make it more rigid by needless interpretations, unless the interpretations are really warranted. This is what I am hoping we do in the new constitution, that we can provide solutions for problems and clarify a lot of the areas that have to be clarified, but still keep it as flexible as possible.

---

## ORIGINAL INDEX: FOR REFERENCE ONLY

In order to standardize the design of all UNOHP transcripts for the online database, they have been reformatted, a process that was completed in early 2012. This document may therefore differ in appearance and pagination from earlier printed versions. Rather than compile entirely new indexes for each volume, the UNOHP has made each transcript fully searchable electronically. If a previous version of this volume existed, its original index has been appended to this document for reference only. A link to the entire catalog can be found online at <http://oralhistory.unr.edu/>.

## A

Academic Standards Committee, 115-116  
 Activities Board, 38, 39, 55, 145  
 Adamian, Paul, 6, 8, 9, 36, 37, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 86, 87, 88, 96, 100, 101, 110, 111, 112, 127  
 Africans, 65  
 Alcoholic Beverage Policy, 29, 47-48, 129  
 Allum, Bob, 38  
   See also: Elections  
 Alumni Association, 1-4, 6, 11, 17-18  
 American Association of University Professors, 5-13, 73  
 Anderson, Fred, 83  
 Andrews, Jonathan, 41, 100, 104  
 Appleton, Nathan, 65  
 Armstrong, Charles, 67  
 Associated Students of the University of Nevada, 14-34, 44, 58, 66, 91, 94, 98, 141, 142  
 Associated Students of the University of Nevada Senate, 14, 25, 35-49  
 Athletics, 15, 16, 44-47, 90-91, 123, 130-131  
   See also: Black Athletes; Intercollegiate Athletics  
 Attorney General, 85, 119, 136

## B

Baez, Joan, 94  
 Barbagelata, Gene, 119  
 Barmettler, Edmund R., 29, 83, 86, 106  
   See also: Faculty Senate  
 Barnes, Heather, 50, 51  
 Basta, Sam M., 43  
 Bedrosian, Tod, 131  
 Bell Code, 118-119, 120  
   See also: Bell, Thomas G.  
 Bell, Thomas G., 43, 76, 85, 138-139  
   See also: Bell Code  
 Bilbray, James, 64, 88  
 Black athletes, 57, 62, 63  
 Black Panther Party, 56  
 Black students, 41, 101  
   See also: Black Students Union  
 Black Students Union, 50-66  
 Black Studies Program, 64  
 Black Week, 51, 52, 54, 55  
 Bond, Julian, 53  
 Bookstore (ASUN), 102-104  
 Boosters Club, 89, 90, 91  
 Bowen, Peggy Lear, 39, 130, 142, 143, 144  
 Boyd, Alex, 50  
 Budget (UN), 10-11, 107, 131  
 Burnside, Alan, 43  
   See also: Experimental College  
 Butler, Barbara, 65



## C

Calendar reform (4-4-1 plan), 24, 48-49, 117  
Campus orientation, 57  
Carey, Quintin, 65  
Cashell, Bob, 121  
Caudle, Sheila, 125  
See also: *Sagebrush*  
Center of Intercultural Documentation, 97  
Code of Conduct, 9, 107  
Community College System, 68, 70, 73  
Constitution (ASUN), 91-92, 144-145  
Coordinating Council, 10, 119, 120  
Cords, Howard, 9  
Cotton, George, 50, 65  
See also: Black Students Union  
Cowboys, 35, 52, 65, 82  
Cuno, Mike, 125

## D

Davis, Emerson, 65  
Dean of Men, 75, 135, 137, 138  
Dean of Students, 75, 137  
Del Papa, Frankie Sue, 14, 37, 41, 85  
See also: ASUN  
Desert Research Institute, 67, 68, 73  
Dickerson, Harvey, 85  
Donnelly, Charles R., 70  
Drake, St. Claire (Dr.), 53  
Drugs, 20, 88, 99  
Durkee, Norm, 126

## E

Educational Opportunities Program, 51  
Edwards, Harry (Dr.), 52  
Elections (student), 38-40, 98, 130, 141-144

Elko, Nevada, 22, 82  
Elko Community College, 69  
See also: Community College System  
Ethnic Studies Program, 64  
Experimental College, 41, 93-105

## F

Faculty Senate, 11, 18, 25, 86, 106-120  
Fallon, Nevada, 17  
Far Western Conference, 122  
Finance Control Board, 38, 55, 94, 95, 123, 145  
Fuller, Eric, 65

## G

General Electric, 20  
Golden Reunion, 2  
Goodman, Paul, 21  
Governor's Day (1970), 9, 27, 28, 32, 35, 75, 80-82, 87, 96, 100, 110, 111, 118, 137, 138, 139  
See also: Adamian, Paul  
Graduation Tea, 2  
Graham, Michael S. "Mike," 125  
Grant, Archie C., 74  
Grotegut, Eugene K., 5  
See also: AAUP  
Guild, Clark Jr., 121

## H

Halvorson, John (Director of Admissions), 58, 61  
Hardaway, George, 50  
Harder, Kelsie, 126  
Hardesty, Jim, 37  
Hayden, Tom, 94  
Hazzard, Ben, 53  
Henry, Melvin, 50  
Homecoming, 1  
Honors Board, 131

Hug High School, 52, 54,  
57, 58, 59, 60  
Hug, Procter Jr., 75, 83,  
87, 88, 118  
Humphrey, Neil (Chancellor),  
12, 67, 73

## I

Indians, 57, 58, 64  
Intercollegiate Athletics,  
89, 90, 121-124  
Interim Code of Conduct,  
6, 9, 29, 42, 75, 76,  
77, 96, 117, 118, 120,  
127, 135, 138, 140

## J

Jackson, Douglas J., 61  
Jackson, John, 65  
Jacobsen, Harold, 67  
See also: Regents, Board  
of  
Jot Travis Union, 87, 136

## K

Kent State, 80, 81, 100,  
129  
Kess, Art, 1  
Kinney, Robert G. (Dean),  
42  
Klaich, Daniel J., 49, 98  
Koizumi, Mike, 137, 138

## L

Las Vegas, Nevada, 17, 18  
Lawlor, Glenn "Jake," 121  
Laxalt, Paul, 69, 121  
Leo's Den, 48  
Legislature (Nevada State),  
6, 7, 10, 11, 17, 18,  
25, 26, 27, 48  
Libke, Joseph (Dr.), 44  
Library (UN), 113

Lombardi, Louis, 85  
Long-haired students, 35,  
98, 99  
Lundemo, John, 98, 141,  
142

## M

Mack, Arma, 54  
Mackay Day, 47  
Maher, Fred, 82  
Martin, Warren (Dr.), 28  
McDermott, Paul, 76  
McKinney, Dan, 36, 41, 53,  
56  
McQueen, Robert (Dr.), 61  
Mexican-Americans, 57, 58,  
64  
Miller, Janice, 43, 133  
See also: Student  
Judicial Council  
Miller, N. Edd (President),  
12, 53, 61, 70, 82, 87,  
91, 108, 129, 138  
Miltenerberger, Pat, 59  
Monterey Peninsula College,  
59  
Mordy, Wendell, 67  
Morrill Hall, 1, 2  
Morris, William (Regent),  
44

## N

Nevada State Press Associ-  
ation, 131  
Nevada Technical Institute,  
68, 142  
Nye Hall, 145

## O

O'Callaghan, "Mike"  
(Governor), 6, 10, 11,  
48, 107  
Ohio State, 106



## P

Perkins, Charles A. "Gus,"  
1  
    See also: Alumni  
    Association  
Phillips, Virginia, 2  
Pine, Edward L., 83  
Plummer, Marilyn, 50  
Profanity Policy, 128-129  
Publications Board, 38,  
128

## R

Race Relations Center, 55  
Raggio, William, 85  
Referrals Board, 42, 134,  
136, 138  
Regents, Board of, 2, 5, 7,  
8, 9, 10, 15, 20, 21, 22,  
25-26, 31, 33, 36, 37,  
40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 64,  
67-92, 96, 100, 110, 111,  
117, 118, 119, 120, 123,  
128, 129, 130, 136, 137,  
138, 139, 140  
Reno Aces, 46  
Reno High School, 50, 59  
Reno Silver Sox, 46  
Rippetoe, Braden, 39  
Romero, Neil, 1  
ROTC, 32, 80, 81

## S

Sagebrush, 66, 98, 101,  
125-132  
Sattwhite, Jesse, 35, 36,  
50, 53, 85, 101, 135,  
136-137, 138, 139  
Schindler, Arthur D., 141  
School of Agriculture, 9  
School of Nursing, 7  
Scott, Robert, 60  
Seeliger, Albert, 85  
Sierra Pacific Power Com-  
pany, 3  
Squaw Valley Leadership  
Meeting, 83

Stead Air Force Base, 68,  
94  
Student Judicial Council,  
35, 42, 44, 47, 133-146  
Symposium, 28

## T

Teglia, Dan, 41, 93, 100,  
104  
Test, Louis, 35  
    See also: ASUN Senate  
Thompson, Helen, 64  
Thornton, Barbara, 19  
Trachok, Richard, 90, 121  
    See also: Intercolle-  
    giate Athletics

## U

United Student Alliance,  
101  
University Code, 11, 86,  
111, 113  
University of California,  
77, 106  
University of Nevada, Las  
Vegas, 14, 15, 63, 64,  
67, 89, 91  
University Senate, 14  
Upward Bound, 59

## V

Vaughn, Ken, 58, 59, 60

## W

Walker, Lloyd, 50  
Ward, John M. 68  
Washoe County School Board,  
55  
Weatherford, Kevin, 98, 100  
Wellinghoff, Jon, 73  
West, John, 51, 61  
West Coast Athletic Con-  
ference (WCAC), 89, 122  
White, Helen, 65

White, Juanita, 85  
Williams, Lincoln, 50  
Willis, James, 65  
Wixon, Tom, 125  
Women's Liberation, 22  
Wooster High School, 59

XYZ

Yerington, Nevada, 17

FOR REFERENCE ONLY

